FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 209

27 October 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Andropov Replies to PRAVDA Questions on INF [PRAVDA 27 Oct] AA 1
Comparison of Andropov's Replies AA 4
Andropov's Replies Publicized AA 4
Arbatov Interviewed on Detente, 'Extremist' U.S. [London BBC] AA 4
Soviet Missile Deployment Close to NATO Viewed [Bogachev] AA 6
Soviet 'Missile Monopoly' in Europe Denied [Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Oct] AA 7
Soviet, U.S. INF Delegations Meet 25 Oct AA 10
START Delegations' Plenary Meetings Noted AA 10
25 Oct Meeting AA 10
27 Oct Meeting AA 11
USSR Efforts To 'Outlaw' Nuclear Arms Touted [Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 25 Oct] AA 11
Soviet INF Delegation Meets With FRG Deputies AA 14

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

AFP: Kremlin Cancels Warsaw Pact Summit BB 1
Socialist TU Safety Forum Held in Kiev [IZVESTIYA 13 Oct] BB 1
Socialist State, Law Institute Directors Confer [IZVESTIYA 22 Oct] BB 2
Socialist Countries' Education Conference Held [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Oct] BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

UN Security Council Discusses Issue of Grenada CC 1
U.S. 'Aggression' Charged CC 1
U.S. in 'Total Isolation' CC 2
Grenadian Envoy Alleges 'Deception' CC 4
USSR Proposes Chemical Weapons Freeze to UN CC 4
Helsinki Talks in Preparation for CSCE Reported [Vukolov, Gorbunov] CC 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Shabayev on 'Real Aims' of U.S. in Lebanon A 1
U.S. Demonstrators Protest Grenada 'Aggression' A 1
U.S. 'Militarist' Foreign Policy Assailed [Kornilov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Oct] A 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

S. Korea War Preparations 'Brazen Threat' C 1
DPRK Presents Citations to Soviet Technicians C 1

SOUTH ASIA

Official Indian-PRC Talks Resume in Delhi D 1
[IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]
Gromyko Meets With New Indian Ambassador D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Aliyev Leaves for Hanoi; Seen Off by Grishin E 1
[PRAVDA 27 Oct]
Stopover in Tashkent E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

CPCZ Presidium Statement on Missiles Published F 1
[PRAVDA 26 Oct]
Communique Issued on Honecker-Husak Talks F 2
[PRAVDA 26 Oct]
Shevardnadze, Zimyanin Receive GDR's Stief F 2
[PRAVDA 23 Oct]
Comparison of GDR Defense Council Statement F 3
Correction to Comparison of Tikhonov Departure F 3

WESTERN EUROPE

Action in Grenada Condemned in UK Parliament G 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Moscow Reports on Bush Trip to Lebanon H 1
U.S. Tries To 'Link' Moscow With Beirut Blasts H 1
U.S. Envoy's 'Base Slander' H 1
[Krivopalov in IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]
Blast Used as 'Pretext' H 2
Al-Qadhdhafi Scores U.S. 'Aggression' in Grenada H 2
Relations, Cooperation With PDRY Praised H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Ponomarev Receives ANC General Secretary J 1
Moscow on Somalia Since October Revolution J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

USSR 'Firmly Condemns' U.S. Action in Grenada [PRAVDA 27 Oct] K 1
Further Reportage on Events in Grenada K 1
'Big Naval Grouping' K 1
82d Airborne Arrival K 2
'Invaders' Facing Rebuff K 2
'Last' Cuban Stronghold Falls K 2
Cuba on U.S. 'Bombing' K 3
Latin American Leaders Commention Grenada K 3
Castro Statement Cited K 3
Mexico's 'Deep Concern' K 4
Guyana Hits 'Immoral Invasion' K 4
Burnham Praises Resistance K 4
Ecuadoran Denunciation K 5
U.S. 'Hegemonistic' Policy Reaffirmed in Grenada K 5
[Zholkver]
U.S. Intervention 'Flouting' UN Charter K 5
[Chigir]
Reasons for U.S. Attack on Grenada Ridiculed K 7
[Lavrentyev]
Further Criticism of U.S. Role in Grenada K 9
Reagan Remarks 'Mendacious' K 9
[Kolesnikov]
U.S. Congressmen Cited K 10
More U.S. Legislators Cited K 11
[Zholkver]
U.S. 'Exploitation' Hit K 11
[Vedenyapin]
Multinational 'Coverup' K 12
World Nations Assail U.S. Actions in Grenada K 13
Countries in 'Uproar' K 13
[Chigir]
UK 'Sobering Up' K 14
[Gan]
France Issues Condemnation K 15
Italy 'Did Not Agree' K 15
CSSR Demands 'Withdrawal' K 15
Hungary 'Deeply Shocked' K 15
GDR 'Solidarity' With Grenada K 16
Romanian Condemnation K 16
PRC on 'Gross Violation' K 16
Correction to Item on U.S. Actions in Nicaragua K 16

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Reports Supreme Soviet Plan, Budget Debate R 1
[25 Oct]

Trade Union Head Urges Unity in Antiwar Struggle R 2
[Sofia TRUD 24 Oct]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Marshal Petrov Observes Firing Practice V 1
[Bedzhanyan in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Improving Military Training V 1
Need for Legal Education V 1
[Editorial, 15 Oct]
Technical Training V 2
[Balabov, 13 Oct]

ANDROPOV REPLIES TO PRAVDA QUESTIONS ON INF

PM261720 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 1

["Yu.V. Andropov Replies to Questions from the Newspaper PRAVDA"; words in uppercase published in boldface]

[Text] Question: What is the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks on the limiation of nuclear arms in Europe, under way in Geneva? Is any progress at all being made there?

Answer: Unfortunately, there is no progress in the direction of an understanding [dogovorennost] at the talks. The impasse situation there continues. Why this is so is now clear, it seems to me, even to the most faithful U.S. allies, and only bloc loyalty prevents them from acknowledging this openly.

During the 2 years of talks the Soviet Union has proved convincingly that it is ready to resort to bold solutions for the sake of diverting the nuclear danger from Europe and strengthening security on our continent and throughout the world. The proposals we have made provide for a wide range of possible measures: from substantial reductions in medium-range nuclear means to the complete elimination of both tactical and medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. They contain all the necessary elements for a mutually acceptable understanding infringing no one's interests -- neither those of the USSR and its allies, nor those of the United States, nor those of the West European states.

Numerous statements have been made in Washington recently to the effect that the United States also favors an understanding and that it has begun demonstrating great flexibility at the talks. We have carefully analyzed all these statements as well as what is being said by the American delegation in Geneva. It proves on examination that the American flexibility is no more than verbal. The substance of the U.S. line in fact remains unchanged: It aims at securing significant military superiority for itself over the USSR by deploying the new American missiles in Europe.

As long as the United States adheres to its unrealistic, one-sided position, according to which the USSR is supposed to reduce its medium-range nuclear arms while the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty allies increase theirs, it is of course impossible to count on progress at the talks.

Question: Are all possibilities for achieving an understanding exhausted?

Answer: That depends above all on the United States, and on whether it is prepared to embark on a businesslike discussion. The Soviet Union will not give up the search for an understanding as long as the United States does not make that impossible by its actions.

We have displayed and are displaying flexibility in finding specific solutions, given the observance of a single but immutable demand: The balance of forces in Europe in terms of medium-range nuclear armaments must not be violated. The level of these armaments on both sides can and must be radically lowered, but in such a way that the correlation of forces between them remains unchanged.

This means, first, that the new American missiles must not be deployed in Europe, inasmuch as this would sharply alter the entire military-strategic situation in NATO's favor. Second, all the nuclear means of the relevant range on both sides must be taken into consideration -- with no exceptions.

We will not retreat from this fair demand. But within the framework of this principled approach we, I repeat, are displaying flexibility and constructiveness. I can mention now certain additional steps of ours in this context.

FIRST. The Soviet Union, as is known, has voiced its readiness to negotiate a reduction in medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe down to identical levels for both sides in terms both of delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) and of the charges on them. Some people are asking: But how will the Soviet Union act if, in order to ensure equality in warheads on the missiles of the USSR on the one hand and of Britain and France on the other, it would have to have fewer missile launchers [puskovyye ustanovki raket] than the NATO side already possesses?

Well, we are prepared to agree to this too. We are not troubled by the fact that with such an approach -- and bearing in mind the number of warheads on the British and French missiles at present -- the USSR could have approximately 140 SS-20 missile launchers in Europe, that is, appreciably fewer than the medium-range missile launchers possessed by Britain and France.

SECOND. Not so long ago we stated that, given the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement -- including the abandonment by the United States of the deployment of the missiles in Europe -- the Soviet Union would eliminate all its missiles subject to reduction in the European zone instead of relocating them in the east. And again some people ask: But will it not happen that, parallel with the elimination of the missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union, the number of such missiles will be built up in the Soviet Union's eastern regions, which could subsequently be redeployed [perebrosheny] from east to west?

There are no grounds for such fears. But to eliminate altogether any doubts on this score I can state unequivocally: Soviet missiles will not be moved from east to west; in the event an agreement is reached on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe and it is implemented, from that moment there will be a halt to the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern regions of the USSR. And we will proceed firmly from this, provided there are no substantial changes in the strategic situation in the Asian region. This means primarily that the United States does not deploy new medium-range nuclear means in regions from which they could reach the eastern part of the USSR's territory.

THIRD. It is sometimes said that our proposal that each side would retain, after reduction, no more than 300 medium-range nuclear weapon carriers very much curtails [podrezayet] American airborne means with a corresponding range of action.

Our objective is not to restrict [ushchemlyat] the United States. Although in fairness it is worth recalling that Soviet medium-range aircraft are not based in other countries from which they could reach U.S. territory.

But here too we are prepared to display additional flexibility: To establish for the USSR and NATO equal total levels of medium-range carrier-aircraft in a mutually acceptable quantitative range which could be substantially different from the range proposed by us previously. The specific size of these levels could be agreed upon, and also the composition of the carrier-aircraft subject to limitation could be specified.

There is a way out of the impasse in which the Geneva talks have found themselves. It is only necessary to make use of it. If the United States were to display a real desire to proceed to a mutually acceptable accord it would not take much time to formulate an agreement.

Question: Some people in the West express the view that, as a display of goodwill, the Soviet Union could proceed right now to reduce its missiles in Europe unilaterally. What would you say on this?

Answer: Yes, appeals of this kind are known to us. Sometimes they even come from people who are truly concerned about preserving peace in Europe.

It is not for us to show goodwill. On our side there has been no shortage of steps, including unilateral steps, aimed at creating the most favorable situation for achieving success at the talks.

I would remind people that 1 and 1/2 years ago the USSR imposed a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in its European part. And, despite all the slanders, this moratorium is being unswervingly observed. The additional deployment of missiles beyond the Urals was also stopped -- in regions from which they could reach West European countries.

Moreover, during the period that the talks have been in progress the Soviet Union has removed from its armory several dozen [ne odin desyatok] of its medium-range missiles in Europe. SS-5 missiles which were previously deployed in the European zone and which, incidentally, had a range no less than that of the SS-20 and were greatly superior to them in terms of size of charge, have now been taken completely out of commission [vyvedeny iz boyevogo sostava].

Those who are calling on the USSR to reduce unilaterally the number of its medium-range missiles may not know that in fact we are already doing this. But of course, both the U.S. Government and the governments of the other NATO countries are well informed about the true state of affairs. However, they are concealing the truth from their own peoples and are deceiving them.

Meanwhile Washington is stubbornly working toward embarking on the deployment of its Pershings and cruise missiles in West Europe in the very near future. Nothing indicates that the United States would be prepared to renounce this deployment if the Soviet Union were to continue in the future unilaterally to reduce its missiles. On the contrary, everything indicates the reverse. Therefore the Soviet Union naturally cannot and will not risk its own security and the security of its allies.

It would be another matter if the United States were to renounce the deployment of its missiles in Europe at the announced time and were thereby to provide an opportunity to continue the talks and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. Then we could embark right now on the reduction of our SS-4 missiles (and we have over 200 of them) and complete the elimination of them in 1984-85. And if it were possible to conclude an agreement in Geneva on the fair basis that we have repeatedly mentioned, a considerable proportion of the existing SS-20 missiles would also be eliminated, of course.

Question: Statements are being made in the Western capitals to the effect that the talks will receive fresh impetus and will become more productive with the start of the deployment of the American missiles. How do you assess such statements?

Answer: They are sheer deception aimed at abating the intensity of the West European peoples' struggle against the appearance of American nuclear missiles in Europe.

There must be total clarity on this point: The appearance of new American missiles in West Europe will make it impossible to continue the talks now being held in Geneva. On the other hand, the Geneva talks can be continued if the United States does not embark on the actual deployment of the missiles.

Comparison of Andropov's Replies

The text of Andropov's replies to PRAVDA that was carried by Moscow TASS in English at 1800 GMT on 26 October has been compared with the above Moscow PRAVDA in Russian version, revealing the following variations:

Page AA 1, second paragraph, first line, TASS version reads: ...the direction of accord at the talks...(changing "an understanding" to "accord")

Page AA 2, second paragraph, penultimate line, TASS reads: ...on the other side, it would be compelled to have a smaller number of missile launchers than NATO already has? (supplying alternate wording).

Fourth paragraph, sixth line, TASS reads: ...the Soviet Union, there would be a build up of such missiles in its eastern areas and they could then be moved from the east to the west? (supplying alternate wording).

Sixth paragraph, second line, TASS reads: ...than 300 medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles supposedly excessively undercuts the American aviations systems of the corresponding range. (new paragraph) We have no aim to impinge on the United States... (supplying alternate wording).

Page AA 3, fifth paragraph, first line, TASS reads: ...the Soviet Union has retired more than one dozen of its medium-range missiles in Europe. By now all the SS-5 missiles that were previously deployed in the European zone and which, incidentally, had a no lesser range than the SS-20's while exceeding them greatly by yield of warhead, have been phased out. (new paragraph) Those who are...(supplying alternate wording).

Andropov's Replies Publicized

Text of "Yu.V. Andropov Replies to Questions from the Newspaper PRAVDA" was carried by the following Soviet media:

Page 1 of the 27 October issue of IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition);

Moscow TASS in English at 1800 GMT on 26 Oct 83;

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 26 Oct 83 (announcer-read);

Moscow Television Service on 26 Oct 83 at 1800 GMT and 2000 GMT, at the latter time in place of "The World Today" program (announcer-read).

ARBATOV INTERVIEWED ON DETENTE, 'EXTREMIST' U.S.

LD262219 London BBC Domestic Service in English 0815 GMT 25 Oct 83

[From "Today" program; interviewer unidentified]

[Text] Interviewer: The Soviet Union announced yesterday that it has begun the preparations to deploy new tactical nuclear missiles in East Germany and Czechoslovakia -- these are the SS-20's and SS-23's. It described the move as one of the planned responses in case new American missiles are sited in Western Europe -- Pershing and cruise. Now it so happens that yesterday also saw the publication of a book called "Cold War or Detente: The Soviet Viewpoint." It was written by Mr Georgiy Arbatov, who is the director of the Institute of United States and Canadian Studies in Moscow and chief adviser in the Kremlin on American affairs. Mr Arbatov is in London this week and is here with me. Good Morning.

[Arbatov] Good morning.

[Interviewer] Do you think that we are now on the brink of the second cold war?

[Arbatov] Well, I think that we are just crossing this brink, maybe, and it is really a very crucial period in which we are now; and you have a tremendously explosive mixture of different trends at the moment. One of them: the general development of strategic sorts of weapons systems, of strategy which led to some people to believe, in the United States especially, despite what Mr Reagan said, that nuclear war is winnable and is possible to fight a protracted nuclear war [sentence as heard]. The other: Government in the United States, which in my opinion, is an extremist government. And the third: that we will have a new round of arms race now. These three ingredients make really an explosive mixture and it can be even worse than cold war.

[Interviewer] Now, does nobody in the Soviet Union believe that a nuclear war can be won?

[Arbatov] No, well you know maybe there are some insane people: I cannot guarantee for them, but you know for many years, it is not only clear, it is the official military and political doctrine that nuclear war cannot be survived and nuclear weapons can be used to deter possible aggression.

[Interviewer] Why then deploying new tactical nuclear missiles, because very time one side makes a move in that direction, and the other side makes a countermove, the situation gets worse. Somebody has to take the first step backwards.

[Arbatov] Well you know it is...[changes thought] would there be symmetrical thinking on both sides, I think then maybe an initiative would help. And the initiative could be anything you want, from ping-pong games, as we remember: sometimes even this is enough. But here we see very clearly for several years that the United States is in for superiority; they tried to...they couldn't adjust to this situation of approximate parity -- although I would say we are generous when we call it parity -- I mean the whole geopolitical situation, if we take all our possible adversaries, etc. but we have rough parity and we are satisfied with it, and we would like to put it lower, as low as possible.

[Interviewer] The Americans would argue the opposite, that you are always slightly ahead of, therefore they must catch up.

[Arbatov] Well, it never was so. If you remember from '45 they had monopoly on nuclear weapons; we had none of their weapons. Then they had monopoly on means of delivery; we had no means of delivery. And if you take all the major weapon systems in history, the Americans were first -- with MIRV's, with submarine-launched missiles, with cruise missiles now. So with all this, we had to catch up. How wisely we did it, this can be argued, but I think we had simply no way out. It was very difficult for us, and you know, we got to learn afterwards, especialy when some documents were declassified, that it was good thing that we cared about our defense because Americans in first cold war had really already some contingency plans like Dropshot, (?NAC)-68...58... and some others -- no, 68 [corrects himself] -- which were for, you know, for really bringing their former ally to the knees.

[Interviewer] Well, now what is to be done? You talk about detente being more difficult than escalation and, therefore, people shrink from it; but do you see detente as the only possible escape?

[Arbatov] Well, you know, I wouldn't insist on a word; detente is actually in British mouths a bit foreign word. We use relaxation of tension in Russian. And I think that now we have tremendous tension in our relations, which is really very dangerous, it is the correct word to use: relaxation of tension. Actually, detente means approximately the same in French.

[Interviewer, interrupting] How do you relax...

[Arbatov] We have no ways out if we want really to stay away from catastrophic, you know, holocaust.

[Interviewer] Well, do you think that strategic arms reduction talks must be seen to be making some progress for that relaxation to occur?

[Arbatov] Well, you know, of course the major point is the initial intentions and we have grave doubts -- it is a euphemism, and even we have no doubts now -- about bad intentions from American side. Because it's not only being called the empire of evil, and being promised that we will be thrown out to the ash heap of history -- I mean not only this rhetoric. The whole policy is such that the administration returned to some mentality of early twenties, when the Bolshevik Russia was accepted as some, you know, bastard of history, something born out of wedlock, which has to be redone. Russia has to be, Soviet Russia has to be done away with, and it was tried several times -- I am sorry to say with participation of the British. The late Winston Churchill invented this famous mot that the child must be strangled in its cradle; It was about our country and our new regime. And this administration is out for it. Of course, there's no [word indistinct] they know that there's no so simple to just to start a nuclear war [setence as heard]. But all the policy will show that they are on the warpath and this situation they look upon any arms control negotiations as a tactical means just to deceive their opposition.

[Interviewer] Mr Arbatov, thank you very much.

SOVIET MISSILE DEPLOYMENT CLOSE TO NATO VIEWED

LD262059 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- TASS military new analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Under the incumbent administration the Pentagon's military planning is characterised by utter disregard for the factors which may lead to a dangerous destabilization of the world world military-political situation.

This is demonstrated, in particular, by the latest adjustments in NATO's plans which now envision "the use of tactical nuclear weapons at the initial stage of combat operations in Europe." In view of Washington's refusal to follow the Soviet example and renounce the first use of nuclear weapons and the planned deployment in West Germany of U.S. Pershing-2 missiles, capable of reaching Soviet territory within six minutes, this "doctrinal innovation" of the Pentagon dramatically aggravates tension in Europe.

It seems that Washington is gradually losing the ability rationally to evaluate the consequences of its military steps to U.S. security. High-ranking spokesman for the Reagan administration are now offering the "potential adversary," that is, the population of socialist countries, "to go to sleep in fear of a U.S. nuclear attack."

The Soviet Union holds a sober view of the adventuristic thinking of the Pentagon leaders and bears in mind the nuclear capability of the United States. The sides have such military technological potentialities that the imperialist countries will be unable to secure military superiority either during preparations for nuclear warfare or at the time when they will attempt to launch nuclear war. The high combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces is a guarantee of Soviet security and a dependable shield for all the countries of the socialist community.

The Soviet Union has no intention to renounce its commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The USSR, however, cannot help responding to Washington's dangerous plans. One of the planned responses to the deployment of Pershings and cruises in Europe would be the stationing of Soviet operational-tactical missile systems close to the borders of the NATO countries so that their flight time to target will be 4-5 minutes. Measures will be taken in response with regard to the territory of the United States itself.

It is not yet late to check the dangerous slide to such a destablisation of the world situation when, as a result of the fulfillment of the U.S. plans, the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear war will grow dramatically because of miscalculations and errors and when the risk of developments getting out of hand will grow quite high. It is towards this situation that the Reagan administration is now pushing the world by planning to deploy its first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe.

Taking forced measures to ensure their security, the socialist countries are at the same time stressing that their proposals aimed at lowering the level of armed confrontation in Europe, at ending the arms race and at stabilizing the situation in the continent remain in force.

To improve the situation in Europe, it is necessary for the United States to show goodwill in reaching agreement on nuclear weapons on the basis of equality and equal security of the sides.

SOVIET 'MISSILE MONOPOLY' IN EUROPE DENIED

PM251711 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Oct 83 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Reason Must Prevail"]

[Text] There is still time. The opportunity still exists to reach agreement at the Soviet-American talks being held in Geneva on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. But there is less and less time left. And the situation is becoming increasingly acute in connection with the U.S. and NATO plans to deploy new types of American nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries.

Washington long ago stopped hiding the fact that it gambles on military force as the chief instrument in pursuing international affairs and the chief means in implementing the hegemonist U.S. foreign policy. "The United States intends to flex its military muscles all over the world on a scale unprecedented for many years.... Everything attests to the Reagan administration's tendency toward increasingly frequent and large-scale demonstrations of American military strength," writes the magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, mouthpiece of transatlantic monopoly circles. "As for Europe," U.S. Under Secretary of State Schneider cynically declares, "the possibility of waging a land war is contemplated there." Finally, the head of the White House himself has announced publicly that he will pursue a policy of "peace through strength," peace through fear.

It is within the framework of this policy that Washington is seeking to deploy its medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe. Attempts are being made on the propaganda plans to justify these actions, which are destabilising the situation not only on the continent but also throughout the world, with references to some USSR "monopoly" in medium-range missiles and to the "need" for NATO to counter the Soviet SS-20 missiles with new types of weapons. In fact, however, these references do not stand up to any criticism.

It is well known that for a number of years now approximate equilibrium has been maintained in Europe in the area of medium-range nuclear arms. NATO now has 857 and the USSR 938 carriers of these weapons in this region. As regards NATO, we are talking of U.S. forward-based means. These are the American F-111 and F-4 aircraft stationed at airbases in the FRG, Britain, and other West European countries, FB-111 medium bombers, which are systematially being stationed at European airfields and are earmarked for operations in this region, and the A-6 and A-7 aircraft on board American aircraft carriers on combat duty off the coasts of Europe -- more than 650 units in all. Britain has 64 missiles, and France has 142 missiles and bombers. The range (radius) of all these means is from 1,000 km to 4,500 km. They are capable of reaching targets on USSR territory as far as the Urals.

The Soviet Union counters this NATO grouping with SS-20 and SS-4 missiles (the SS-5 missiles have been totally removed from the arsenal and dismantled) and medium bombers. Thus, as of 1 October 1983 the number of medium-range carriers of nuclear weapons in the USSR's European zone is approximately equal to the number of medium-range carriers at NATO's disposal, while in terms of the number of nuclear charges launched at the target at one time -- a very important indicator -- the North Atlantic bloc even has superiority, and considerable superiority -- almost 50 percent more.

Consequently, the USSR has no "missile monopoly." The Soviet SS-20 missiles, about which such a fuss is made in the West, are just a counterweight to the NATO countries' nuclear potential. And if we speak of a monopoly, it is precisely the American side that would like to acquire the privilege of keeping near the Soviet borders additional nuclear weapons, which are a strategic factor for the Soviet Union -- 108 Pershing II ballistic missiles and 464 ground-based cruise missiles.

Nor does the Western propaganda services' constant allegation that Pershing and cruise missiles will be deployed to counter the Soviet SS-20 missiles accord with the truth. First, it is known that the decision to develop and prepare for the production of new American medium-range nuclear means was adopted long before the deployment of SS-20's began in the USSR. And second, as is clear from an article in the British newspaper THE OBSERVER, back in January 1979 -- that is, 11 months before the NATO Council's decision, on so-called "arms upgrading" -- at a conference on the island of Guadeloupe the leaders of the United States, the FRG, France, and Britain agreed on the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in West Europe with a view to "widening options for operations" by NATO. "As a result of the modernization of the Soviet forces by means of adding SS-20 missiles to the arsenal," the document approved on Guadeloupe emphasized, "the level of the threat to NATO will apparently not increase substantially." In this connection THE OBSERVER writes not without grounds: "This viewpoint is almost diametrically opposite to the opinion of cruise and Pershing missiles to which official circles on London and Washington now adhere. Last week British Defense Secretary Michael Heseltine emphasized that their addition to the arsenal is a direct consequence of Russia's refusal to dismantle its SS-20 missiles."

The USSR's unilateral disarmament, and military superiority over the Warsaw Pact -- this is what the United States and NATO are really striving for. Preparations to deploy the American missiles are being made for the sake of achieving military superiority. All the American side's dodges at the Geneva talks boil down to attempts to secure the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament. There it is still proposed to reach agreement only on how many Soviet medium-range missiles to reduce and how many American missiles to deploy in Europe in addition to the swollen nuclear arsenals which the North Atlantic bloc countries already have.

A precise and clear assessment of the state of affairs at the Geneva talks was made in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement. That document states most definitely: "They propose that we discuss how to help the NATO bloc to upset in its favor the existing balance in the European zone in terms of medium-range nuclear means." In fact, they demand that the Soviet Union give the go-ahead to the introduction of Pershing and cruise missiles into Europe, not count the nuclear arms of Britain and France on NATO's side, and consent to direct harm to the security of the USSR and its allies. And when the Soviet side refused to satisfy these insolent demands, they accuse it of intransigence.

Incidentally, it is impossible to count all the tricks undertaken by Western countries' official circles with a view to whitewashing their stand on nuclear arms in Europe and slandering the USSR. Here is one of them. Last year the Soviet Union adopted a decision on a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range means in the European zone. Well, occasionally certain figures in the West make slanderous allegations that the USSR does not observe that pledge. Such fabrications have been put forward by FRG Chancellor Kohl, Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister Genscher, and certain other officials. And now they have also been joined by U.S. President Reagan. In conversation with a group of editors of local newspapers and radio stations recently he declared without a trace of embarrassment: "The Russians are continuing to deploy their SS-20 missiles at the rate of one missile a week, each one of which carries three warheads."

Why did the head of the White House need to resort to blatant deception? In order to make his own actions more attractive in the eyes of the public. It is well known what they boil down to. Let us just recall that, having touched at Wednesday's press conference on the question of the U.S. Administration's decision to begin deploying the new American nuclear missile weapons in West Europe at all costs, Reagan declared: "We will deploy them in accordance with the established schedule." Thus, the U.S. President confirmed that, the talks that are continuing in Geneva, notwithstanding, the United States has already made the decision to install its new missiles in West Europe and intends to implement it. Here the President pointed out that the antimissile movement, which, as he acknowledged, has embraced the entire world, will not change Washington's position.

What could one say about this? As was emphasized at the extraordinary session of the Warsaw Pact states' Defense Ministers Committee, "the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe will inevitably lead to a dangerous exacerbation of the whole situation on the continent and throughout the world and to a growing threat of nuclear war with catastrophic consequences for the peoples."

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states have never sought, nor do they seek, military superiority, but neither will they in any circumstances permit military superiority over themselves. If the sinister American plans begin to be implemented, then the USSR together with its allies will be forced to take the necessary countermeasures to preserve the balance of forces both in Europe and directly in respect of the United States.

Here, as a result of the Soviet countermeasures, the threat to the territory of the United States and the West European countries where American medium-range nuclear missile weapons will be deployed will be the same as the United States intends to pose to the Soviet Union and its allies. The USSR cannot permit a direct threat to its security to proceed from the territory of the FRG and certain other NATO countries.

The Soviet Government statement published back in May 1983 pointed out that the realization of the U.S. and NATO plans regarding medium-range weapons will force the USSR to reconsider the decision on a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range means in the European zone. By agreement with the Warsaw Pact allies, additional nuclear means will be deployed as a counterweight to NATO's growing nuclear strength in Europe, and corresponding countermeasures affecting U.S. territory itself will be adopted. The further development and improvement of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces will take place so that they accord with the new nature of the NATO bloc's war preparations and the threat which will take shape for the socialist community countries' security.

At the same time it should be emphasized most strongly that the Soviet Union is a principled opponent of competition in the production of stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. As was pointed out at the session of the Warsaw Pact states' Foreign Ministers Committee held in Sofia, the allied countries advocate the most rapid reaching of an agreement at the Soviet-American talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. They believe that this agreement must provide for the renunciation of the deployment of new medium-range nuclear means on the continent and a corresponding reduction in the existing means, whereby the missiles being reduced will be liquidated, as proposed by the Soviet Union. The agreement must be based on the principle of equality and identical security and promote the stability of the military-strategic situation and the equilibrium of forces.

The Warsaw Pact states voice the conviction that an opportunity for reaching an agreement at the Geneva talks which accords with the peoples' interests still exists. However, if an agreement is not reached at the talks before the end of this year, then the talks must continue for the purpose of reaching one, on condition that the United States and its NATO allies abandon the deadlines which they themselves set for the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles.

These conclusions were considered confirmed by the CEMA countries' heads of government. The statement which they adopted in Berlin points out: "Reason must prevail. The choice must be made in favor of strengthening world peace and the peoples' security and cooperation."

This choice was made long ago by all the socialist community countries and all our planet's progressive, peace-loving forces.

SOVIET, U.S. INF DELEGATIONS MEET 25 OCT

LD251118 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Geneva October 25 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA was held here today at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe.

START DELEGATIONS' PLENARY MEETINGS NOTED

25 Oct Meeting

LD251116 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Geneva October 25 TASS -- The Soviet and U.S. delegations at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments had a plenary meeting here today.

27 Oct Meeting

LD271155 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Geneva October 27 TASS -- The delegations from the Soviet Union and the United States to the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments held a plenary meeting here today.

USSR EFFORTS TO 'OUTLAW' NUCLEAR ARMS TOUTED

PM251619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by Vl. Kuznetsov: "'Pandora's-Box' Adventurists; Averting the Threat of a Nuclear Catastrophe From Mankind"

[Text] Nuclear weapons are compared to "Pandora's box," which the ancient Greeks believed contained all human troubles and misfortunes. This box has already been opened once -- over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. What will happen if it is opened wide over the whole world? About 40 years ago mankind trembled as it glimpsed the nuclear abyss. Now the heirs of those who gave the order for the first nuclear bomb attack are bringing mankind ever closer to the brink of this abyss.

Nuclear weapons are not only dangerous in themselves. The more these weapons are stockpiled, the greater the degree of risk and the more likely the threat of war. A technical hitch, a human error -- and an escalation which cannot be stopped may begin.

Specialists warn of the possibility of the accidental, unpremenditated, or, as they also put it, unsanctioned and unprovoked outbreak of a conflict. This must be considered. But there is also a more substantial cause -- the ill will of those people in the United States who are consciously and deliberately, from one day to the next, leading matters toward the gigantic buildup of their military arsenal, who are "calculating" in their political strategy on unleashing a conflict, who are surreptitiously giving it a material and ideological basis, kindling hatred for a "potential enemy" against whom all means are allegedly good.

The "Directive inthe Defense Field for Fiscal 1984 Through 1988" drafted on instructions from the U.S. President sets an insane goal -- "destroying socialism as a sociopolitical system." Anything can be expected from the compilers of such directives. The statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, on this subject states: "...We cannot fail to wonder whether Washington has any restraints preventing it from crossing the border at which any thinking person must stop."

The Washington and NATO fire-bugs' sinister preparations dictate the need, as the recent Moscow conference of Central Committee secretaries of the socialist countries' communist and workers parties on international and ideological issues acknowledged, "to expose the dangerous nature of their concepts of the 'admissibility' of the first use of nuclear weapons."

The Soviet Union regards the prevention of a nuclear conflict fatal to civilization as the fundamental task of its foreign policy. In its opinion, the most reliable method of preventing a catastrophe is the freezing, limitation, and reduction of nuclear weapons right up to their total liquidation. Disarmament is the most effective guarantee of universal peace and international security. At the same time, because the path to the physical liquidation of nuclear weapons is long and thorny, and losing time may result ina tragedy for mankind, preventive measures suggest themselves in the political, international-law, and moral-political spheres.

These include accords on the settlement of international conflicts and interstate disputes exclusively by peaceful means, through negotiations. They include the enshrinement of the principle of the nonuse of force and its elevation to the rank of a law of international life. They include the renunciation of the propaganda of war, of saber-rattling, and of any attempts to use weapons for the purposes of aggression. The Soviet Union directs its peacemaking energy toward attaining these goals.

Back in 1946 the USSR made a proposal in the United Nations on banning the production and use of nuclear weapons and destroying them within a 3-month deadline. Since then, seeking to avert the threat of nuclear war from mankind, the USSR has put forward and continues to put forward a wide range of measures -- from partial to all-embracing ones -- whose implementation would lead, if not to the complete disappearance of nuclear weapons at once, at at least to a tangible reduction of the threat of the outbreak of a conflict using these weapons. Following this line, at the Second UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament the Soviet Union advanced the idea of drafting, adopting, and gradually implementing a nuclear disarmament program. This program, the Soviet Union considers, could include the halting of the development of new nuclear weapons systems; the halting of the production of fissionable materials for the creation of various types of nuclear weapons; the halting of the production of nuclear munitions of all types and their delivery vehicles; the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, including delivery vehicles; and the total liquidation of nuclear weapons.

Throughout the postwar years the USSR has persistently and purposefully sought to create in interstate and international relations an atmosphere ruling out the use of violent methods and military means, most of all nuclear means.

It was the USSR which issued the initiative in 1949 to conclude a peace pact between the five Great Powers. In 1958 states were offered the Soviet Government declaration on measures to prevent a surprise attack. In 1969 the Soviet Union submitted for the Geneva disarmament conference's examination a draft declaration on banning the propaganda of war (in our country such propaganda is forbidden by law). In 1969 the Soviet UN delegation came out with a draft resolution containing a clear definition of armed aggression as a crime against humanity (the definition of aggression was subsequently adopted by the UN General Assembly). In 1972 the USSR and the U.S. Government reached an agreement on preventing incidents on the high seas and in the airspace above them. In the same year, following a Soviet suggestion, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution "On the Nonuse of Force in International Relations and the Banning in Perpetuity of the Use of Nuclear Weapons." In 1973 the USSR signed with the United States the "Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War." In the seventies our country concluded agreements with France and Britain on preventing the accidental outbreak of nuclear war. In 1976 the USSR submitted for examination by the United Nations the question of concluding a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations and a treaty on renouncing first use of nuclear weapons.

After the all-European conference in Helsinki the Soviet Union suggested to its participants reaching agreement on renouncing first use of both nuclear (November 1976) and conventional weapons (March 1979).

In 1981 the UN General Assembly -- again at the USSR's initiative -- adopted the declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe.

In 1982 from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly Second Special Session on Disarmament the Soviet Union announced its undertaking to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. This unilateral act of goodwill immediately came into force.

In 1983 the Warsaw Pact states suggested to the NATO members the conclusion of a treaty on the reciprocal nonuse of force and the maintenance of relations of peace.

Our country has submitted an urgent and important question -- "freezing nuclear arms" -- to the current UN General Assembly session. Alongside freezing the material preparation for war, the USSR also suggests freezing, figuratively speaking, the psychological and moral-political preparation of war and nuclear adventurism. It has been suggested that the declaration "Denunciation of Nuclear War" be adopted. The Soviet draft envisages discrediting such a war resolutely, unconditionally, and permanently as the most monstrous crime against the peoples. It is suggested that the development, promotion, dissemination, and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts designed to vindicate the "correctness" of the first use of nuclear weapons and the "admissibility" of unleashing a nuclear war in general be declared criminal acts.

This account already attests to how much the Soviet Union has done, relying on the support of the entire socialist community and the assistance of all peace-loving forces, to outlaw weapons of mass annihilation in order to remove from the agenda the question of the preparation of nuclear war as such.

What about the West? NATO leading circles and headquarters are anxious not to parade their aggressive plans, fearing an indignant public reaction. Nor are the stinting their assurances that they will not be the first to launch a nuclear war. But they are reluctant to respond on a reciprocal basis to the USSR's proposals. One asks why?

"We will not deliver a first strike," Eisenhower asserted in Congress in the fall of 1945. However, secret directives approved that same fall by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff stated otherwise. "...Deliver a first strike if necessary," the document stated.

U.S. officials succeeding each other in top state and military posts have vowed and sworn that they are devoted to peace, but through their good offices in postwar years mankind has frequently been a hair's-breadth away from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. According to the figures of the U.S. Brookings Institution, in postwar years Washington's "top level" has on 19 occasions decided whether or not to make first use of nuclear weapons to achieve its end in particular critical situations, including four discussions of plans for the nuclear bombardment of the Soviet Union.

The Pentagon and NATO military wants, come what may, to retain the "right" to a first strike. In postwar years imperialism has shed many doctrines, as a snake sheds its skin. But the thrust of old and new doctrines is the same -- counting on first use of nuclear weapons.

What is true of the doctrines is also true of the potential on whose basis they intend to implement the doctrines. The majority of types of U.S. weapons of mass destruction have been and continue to be created with a view to a first strike -- a preventive or preemptive, disarming or decapitating, or paralyzing strike, to use Pentagon terminology. In October 1981 the White House incumbent announced the "strategic program" for the eighties, providing for the improvement of existing weapons systems and the creation of new ones. Whichever system you take, its function is the same: to serve as a means of attack. The MX ICBM (the President's favorite child) is planned as a first-strike weapon. The Stealth bomber now under development is designed for a surprise attack. Strategic cruise missiles and ballistic missiles on the Trident II submarines are also massive first nuclear strike weapons. The Pentagon pins special hopes on the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe. The Pentagon and NATO make no secret of the fact that they intend to create a powerful nuclear strike force here to strike at the moment they consider suitable.

In order to do away entirely with the question of a first strike and the possibility of unleashing nuclear war in Europe, the Soviet Union suggests making the continent totally nuclear-free, freeing it of all types of weapons of mass annihilation in existence. If this genuine "zero option" does not suit the West, the USSR advocates renouncing the deployment of any new medium-range nuclear systems in Europe and reducing existing systems by two-thirds.

The Pentagon strategists are seeking points and suitable positions for delivering a first strike. Approximately one-third of the U.S. nuclear potential is outside the United States and has been advanced to forward-based positions. Washington is also preparing to turn space into a nuclear war theater.

So it becomes clear why the United States and its NATO allies are reluctant to reciprocate with the USSR by undertaking to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. It is also clear why NATO is still "studying," or to be more precise, putting off the Warsaw Pact members' suggestion to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace.

Historical experience teaches that perfidy and adventurism are in imperialism's very nature. This must be considered. The adventurists who are picking the lock of the nuclear "Pandora's Box" are mankind's most evil enemies. But the peoples are not powerless in the face of nuclear fanaticism. The impressive defense potential of the USSR and the entire socialist community serves as a reliable straitjacket for those who are taking leave of their senses. The warmongers are opposed by the united will of the overwhelming majority of peace-loving states and progressive democratic movements and above all by the powerful world-wide antinuclear front. The nuclear adventurists have no kind of broad support in their own countries.

Averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe -- mankind has no more burning, important, noble, or humane task. The Soviet Union, as a great power, is aware of all the magnitude of its responsibility for ensuring that nuclear weapons are never used anywhere, in any circumstances. Renouncing first use of nuclear weapons, the USSR will persistently seek to ensure that its example is followed by all other possessors of nuclear weapons. Avoiding building its policy on emotions but basing it on common sense, realism, and profound responsibility for the destiny of peace, the Soviet Union is prepared for broad cooperation with all states on this issue of key importance for man's future.

SOVIET INF DELEGATION MEETS WITH FRG DEPUTIES

LD270545 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] There has been a meeting in Geneva of the USSR delegation at the talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe with a group of Bundestag deputies from the Federal Republic of Germany, members of the Subcommittee on Disarmament and Arms Control, headed by Bahr.

AFP: KREMLIN CANCELS WARSAW PACT SUMMIT

NC261419 Paris AFP in English 1355 GMT 26 Oct 83

[By Pierre Bocev]

[Text] Moscow, Oct 26 (AFP) -- The threat posed by the coming deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe is so great that the Kremlin has decided to cancel a Warsaw Pact summit scheduled to take place here this week, apparently to issue a response to the deployment, an informed Soviet source said today.

The Soviet Union announced plans Monday to station new tactical missiles in Czechoslovakia and East Germany in response to the U.S. deployment, set to start in December.

In view of this, the source said, the Soviet leadership decided that the summit Friday and Saturday would serve no purpose. The source also said the threat posed by the U.S. missiles was so great that a Warsaw Pact meeting would not be adequate to deal with it.

He said the Kremlin believed Washington had escalated the arms race to such a level that the threat of an explosion now clearly existed, and that Moscow's top priority was now to make U.S. officials aware of this risk.

Soviet sources also voiced surprise at the relative calmness of the Western reaction to the announcement Monday that "preparatory work" had begun to deploy the new Soviet missiles.

They hoped, however, that the lack of official reaction from Washington meant the United States considers the step to be an extremely serious response.

Thus, Moscow is now awaiting a U.S. response, and any Warsaw Pact summit would come only after that reaction.

The summit would serve to define a potential second phase for the Soviet reprisal against the installation of the 572 Pershing-II and cruise missiles in West Germany, the source said.

If the United States tried to minimize the importance of Monday's announcement, then "we would have to be even clearer" and adopt a firmer attitude, perhaps including more reprisals, the source said.

On the other hand, if the United States "takes us seriously," a conciliatory gesture might not be ruled out on the Soviet side.

Analysts said that position seemed to reflect some indecision, perhaps caused by the closeness of the deployment date. Several specialists said that Soviet diplomacy, which has a reputation for slowness, could not react quickly to developments in Europe.

Still, the Russians clearly believe the deployment of the medium-range missiles is a matter of the utmost gravity. "The future of humanity is hanging by a thread," a senior Soviet journalist said recently.

SOCIALIST TU SAFETY FORUM HELD IN KIEV

PM210758 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Trade Union Cooperation"]

[Text] Kiev, 11 Oct -- An exchange of experience on the fraternal socialist countries' trade unions' work in labor safety is the topic of a conference in the Ukrainian capital.

Taking part in it are representatives of the trade union centers of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia, and also a delegation from the Polish State Inspectorate for Labor Safety.

The conference stressed that in the socialist society concern for improving working conditions had been raised to the status of state policy. The fraternal countries' trade unions have accumulated considerable experience in ensuring working peoples' active participation in the administration of labor safety regulations and control over the observance of safety techniques and are constantly exchanging information in this important sphere.

SOCIALIST STATE, LAW INSTITUTE DIRECTORS CONFER

PM241650 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conference Over"]

[Text] A routine conference of directors of the institutes of state and law of the socialist countries' academies of sciences and chief editors of academic journals on legal matters was held in Moscow 18-20 October.

The conference participants voiced satisfaction with the development and strengthening of cooperation among the socialist countries' legal institutes and journals, which is particularly important under modern conditions of the exacerbation of the international situation and the intensification of the ideological struggle. It was pointed out that their joint efforts must be concentrated still more on the most urgent directions of the development of science on the state and law, including fundamental theoretical problems.

A communique was adopted on the results of the conference.

SOCIALIST COUNTRIES' EDUCATION CONFERENCE HELD

PM211413 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Oct Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Last Minute"]

[Text] Warsaw, 17 Oct -- A routine conference of socialist countries' higher education ministers has been held at Mrakovo (Olsztyn Voivodship). Delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, the DPRK, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia took part in it. The Soviet delegation was led by V.P. Yelyutin, USSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education.

The conference participants paid special attention to questions of the communist education of young people in VUZes. The meeting stressed that, in the present-day complex international situation, teachers have a special responsibility to educate the young generation in a spirit of internationalism and active struggle to maintain peace.

UN SECURITY COUNCIL DISCUSSES ISSUE OF GRENADA

U.S. 'Aggression' Charged

LD261524 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 26 TASS -- The U.N. Security Council has started an urgent debate on the issue of the aggression of the United States against Grenada. The armed intervention of the USA is assessed here as a flagrant breach of the U.N. Charter and norms of international law.

The council has been convened at the request of the Government of Nicaragua. The request has also been officially supported by the Government of Libya. The U.S. delegation to the U.N. has made attempts at preventing the urgent convocation of the council and thus to enable the U.S. military complete the bandit operation without U.N. interference. But the manoeuvres have been resolutely rejected by a majority of the Security Council members.

The delegation of Guyana has tabled at the Security Council a draft resolution, which proposes that the armed intervention against Grenada be strongly condemned as a crude attempt on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that state.

The document also calls for an immediate cessation of intervention and the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops from Grenada. The resolution requests the secretary general to follow closely the development of the situation in Grenada and to report to the council within 48 hours on the implementation of the resolution.

Representatives who spoke at the Security Council meeting wrathfully condemned Washington's armed aggression against the defenseless tiny state in the Caribbean. Today, said Porforio Munoz Ledo, the international community witnessed an overt act of aggression against territorial integrity of an independent state, a blatant violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, and attempts at limiting the right of the peoples to self-determination. The representative said that Mexico unconditionally condemned the armed invasion which could not be justified in any way.

The assault on Grenada is a frank demonstration of the principles on which rests the policy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere, said Nicaragua's representative Victor Hugo Tinoko. This policy was reflected in the United States' use of force against Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Chile in the past, and against Nicaragua at present. This policy harbors a threat to any independent state in the world. The shameless armed intervention is a challenge to the generally accepted norms of international law and all the existing regional treaties and agreements.

Guyana's permanent representative to the United Nations N. Sinclair resolutely refuted Washington's false justification of its piratic action, its references to the "request" of the Organization of East Caribbean States. Grenada, he stressed, posed no threat to anyone. There is no international instrument that can be used to justify the aggression.

The aggressor's hand must be stayed, said Cuba's representative Roa Kouri. An independent non-aligned state has become a victim of an unprovoked armed attack mounted by the United States, a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. Does the U.N. Charter give any state the right to launch an invasion under the pretext of filling the "vacuum of power," as the U.S. State Department "explained" this despicable operation against a free nation?

Libya's permanent representative to the U.N. 'Ali 'Abd at-Turayki has described as "international gangsterism" the U.S. attack against Grenada. The Reagan administration is trying to reverse the world to jungle law. Norms of international law has been trampled under foot by the U.S. Marines in Grenada, whose people "inadmissibly sinned" by choosing a government objectionable to Washington.

Grenada's representative I. Jacobs laid bare the blatant lie used by the Reagan administration to justify the lawlessness perpetrated by it. He read out a telegram which the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada addressed to the U.S. Embassy in Barbados on October 24. The telegram had expressed alarm at preparations for an armed invasion (of Grenada). It has stressed that no threat existed to U.S. citizens in Grenada. And President Reagan used precisely this awkward pretext for justifying the aggression! The delegate of Grenada described as sheer mockery Washington's effort to pass off the invasion force as a multinational one. U.S. Marines made up 95 per cent of the force. He disclosed that more than 700 Grenadians had already been killed by them.

It is perfectly obvious, said the USSR's permanent representative to the United Nations Oleg Troyanovskiy, that actions by U.S. Marines and Rangers are aimed, above all, at restoring the United States' domination over the island and re-installing to power the anti-democratic regime rejected by the people. Washington's fresh criminal action is another stage in heightening the situation in Central America and the Caribbean, in the military manoeuvres, under way for more than one year, and in the unprecedented militarist preparations. The aim of these actions are suppression of national liberation movements and interference in the affairs of sovereign countries.

The Soviet Union categorically denounces U.S. imperialism's aggression against the small non-aligned country. The Soviet representative stressed that the Security Council is facing a question of principle: If no resolute rebuff is given now, today, to the United States' arbitrariness, none of the non-aligned countries, especially if its policies -- domestic or foreign -- are not to the White House's liking, may feel safe.

American representative Jeane Kirkpatrick repeated Washington's false "argument" in justification of the brazen, piratic imperialist aggression. Alone under the barrage of trenchant criticism, she launched attacks on the United Nations, describing it as an "outdated institution."

The Security Council will continue debates on the American aggression.

U.S. in 'Total Isolation'

LD270902 Moscow TASS in English 0832 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 27 TASS -- The policy of military arbitrariness and cynical breach of generally accepted norms of international law, overtly pursued by the United States Administration, has been trenchantly criticised at a meeting of the U.N. Security Council discussing the issue of the United States' aggression against Grenada.

As the Security Council is continuing its work, total isolation of the United States in the international arena is becoming ever more evident.

The invasion of Grenada by U.S. troops is a flagrant violation of the U.N. Charter and international law banning interference in the internal affairs of other states, Argentina's representative Carlos Manuel Muniz has declared.

This aggression against the U.N. member state is particularly dangerous against the background of current tensions in the region. Interference in the affairs of Latin American countries gives cause for profound alarm. The Argentine representative demanded full restoration of Grenada's sovereignty and immediate withdrawal of the envading force.

This demand has been backed by Bolivia's delegate Jorge Gumusio-Granie who stressed the right of each nation to decide its future by itself.

Cuba's representative Raul Roa-Kouri has described the U.S. aggression against Grenada as base and perfidious. Modern history, he said, is full of such "feats" of Yankee imperialism. Today, the United States invaded Grenada. Who can say where it will go tomorrow?

The Cuban delegate said that American Armed Forces posted illegally at the naval base of Guantanamo were put on high alert in the morning of October 26. One cannot rule out that the Yankees are preparing an attack on Cuba.

According to Ethiopia's representative Mohamed Hamid Ibrahim, the armed assault on Grenada is one of the manifestations of the policy of violence pursued by the Reagan administration. From Washington's viewpoint, he pointed out, the entire developing world is to become a sphere of influence of the United States. According to this perverted logic, any country that dares to choose an independent path of development becomes a target of secret subversive operations or open military hostilities on the part of the United States. Nicaragua is one of many such targets at the moment.

Algeria's representative Mohamed Sahnun has categorically dismissed Washington's false and hypocritical pretexts for an attack on the independent state. The armed invasion is unjustifiable, said Nigeria's representative O.O. Fafowora. Like other participants in the meeting, he demanded an immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Grenada. Giovinella Gonthier, representative of the Seychelles, drew attention to the extreme danger of the precedent that can be used by the United States in the future to resort to military actions against small countries to "defend" U.S. nationals or U.S. interests.

The United States has never given up its "gunboat diplomacy", Syria's representative Diya' Allah Al-Fattah has said. Washington never concealed its intentions to press for the overthrow of regimes it does not like. It is the United States which is fully responsible for the dangerous tensions in the world.

France's representative Luc de la Barre De Nanteuil has stressed that his government cannot accept the explanations of the armed intervention. It expresses regret over the invasion. The Grenadian people should be given the right to be masters of their destiny.

Vietnam's delegate Hoang Bich Son has voiced solidarity with the Grenadian people. We know from our own experience, he said, the brutality of the aggressor. The entire world should resolutely denounce Washington's reckless actions and prevent "new Vietnams" and dirty wars, similar to those waged by the United States in Indochina.

According to Polish representative Wlodzimierz Natorf, the attack on Grenada is one of the manifestations of the policy of threats and pressure constantly pursued by the United States with regard to Latin American countries. The invasion of Grenada has been thoroughly planned well in advance. The sovereign nation fell victim to cold blood massacre.

The representatives of Laos, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Iran, Pakistan and Zaire backed the demand for the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops. If the American invasion is not repulsed, noted Ling Qing, permanent representative of the People's Republic of China to the U.N., what has the future in store for small and weak countries? He stressed that the United States perpetrated overt aggression that threatens peace and security of the peoples.

The Security Council is continuing debates on the American aggression.

Grenadian Envoy Alleges 'Deception'

LD261100 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 26 TASS -- Ian Jacobs, deputy permanent representative of Grenada to the United Nations, has called on the UN Security Council to condemn in the strongest language the U.S. military intervention into his country, and to call for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Grenada.

Addressing an urgent meeting of the UN Security Council, he said, "Deception has become the name of the U.S. game," ridiculing President Reagan's assertion that the United States was intervening in Grenada to "protect democracy." He pointed out that since 13 March 1979 the United States had been hostile to the revolution in Grenada.

Ian Jacobs read out the text of a telex message sent by the Revolutionary National Council of Grenada to the United States Embassy in Barbados on 24 October. The message expressed concern at reports of a military invasion being planned against Grenada, and condemned the forthcoming invasion as an interference in the internal affairs of Grenada.

He said the United States citizens, inlcuding students, were not in danger in Grenada, a fact that was well known. The claim to the contrary was a pretext for the United States intervention. President Reagan was now trying to convince the world that the United States had intervened under a treaty among the Eastern Caribbean states. The United States was not signatory to that treaty, he stressed. President Reagan, he went on, had tried to justify intervention under Article 8 of the Eastern Caribbean Treaty. But that article said intervention could not come at the request of a member government, or if there was a threat of external aggression.

He said talk of a multinational force in Grenada was an "absolute joke". Ninety-five per cent of the forces in Grenada were United States forces.

He said reports from Grenada's embassies around the world suggested that as many as 700 casualties -- many of them civilians -- had been suffered by Grenada as a result of U.S. military intervention.

USSR PROPOSES CHEMICAL WEAPONS FREEZE TO UN

LD270357 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] The Soviet Union has submitted to the UN a proposal concerning the freezing of production and deployment of chemical weapons until a relevant international convention is concluded. As the Soviet representative Petrovskiy announced at the First Committee of the General Assembly, this initiative has been provoked by the aspiration to create the most favorable conditions possible for talks on the banning of chemical weapons.

HELSINKI TALKS IN PREPARATION FOR CSCE REPORTED

LD261134 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Helsinki October 26 TASS -- TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Gorbunov report:

The preparatory meeting in connection with the holding of the first stage of the conference on measures to build up confidence and security, and on disarmament in Europe, scheduled to be held in Stockholm in January next year, is continuing in session here. The participants in the session are stressing the great significance of the Helsinki meeting, which is designed to ensure a successful holding of the forum in the Swedish capital, whose aim is to develop the multilateral process started by the Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

The preparatory meeting, a TASS correspondent was told in interview by Ambassador Oldrich Pavlovski, the head of the Czechoslovak delegation, is aimed at examining organizational issues of the Stockholm conference, which will, in its turn, discuss problems linked directly with ensuring security not only in Europe, but also all over the world.

It is necessary to stress, O. Pavlovski pointed out, that in the present-day complicated international situation not only official circles, but increasingly wide circles of the world public in many countries declare against the arms race, for preventing the threat of a world thermonuclear catastrophe and developing cooperation between states. The Stockholm conference, the agenda of which is being discussed now, is directed at continuing and deepening dialogue between countries, therefore it is so important to create favourable conditions for its successful work.

Sweden, the TASS correspondents were told by Kurt Kidgard, head of the Swedish delegation, has devoted and continues devoting much attention to attaining the aims of disarmament and ensuring security in the European Continent. It is a great honour to our country to host the first stage of the conference on measures to build up confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe. The questions tabled for discussion at it, K. Lidgard pointed out, are also significant for ensuring Sweden's security. Therefore, we have a great stake in the current meeting and the Stockholm conference ending successfully and bringing about positive results, and thus sealing the process started in Helsinki.

SHABAYEV ON 'REAL AIMS' OF U.S. IN LEBANON

LD261252 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

The echo of the blast in the headquarters of the American Marines in Lebanon has reached the banks of the Potomac and caused, as the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES has put it, a real row among the ranks of legislators on the Capitol Hill. Many of them declare their intention to make the President return the Marines home. Even the Republican leader in the Senate, Howard Baker, addressed such a call to Reagan. President Reagan shall, at last, give the American people an explicit answer why the American lads are sent to die in Lebanon, Democrat leader in Senate Robert Byrd demanded. This question is asked today by many Americans.

But the President had a ready tongue. He told his worried compatriots that the American lads have to spill their blood in Lebanon as that country is allegedly threatened with... "Soviet interference."

The Pentagon chief, Caspar Weinberger, added to the President's "revelations" that the Russians, as he put it, like to fish in troubled waters in that region.

The fraudulent and cynical character of such statements is so obvious that even the American press, which usually zealously supports Washington's policy, this time is not in a hurry to echo the conjectures of the White House. Now not only the world public, but also the American public begin to realise that the main cause of the troubles and sufferings in Lebanon, as of the dangerous tensions in the Middle East as a whole, is the adventurist, militaristic policy of the USA. The present-day situation in Lebanon is a direct result of the Israeli invasion, which has been fully backed by the Reagan administration, and the stationing of American troops on the Lebanese soil. They came there not with peace, but in order to finish what has been started by Israel, to force on Lebanon their protectorate or partition the country, if the whole of it cannot be subordinated.

If anybody had doubts about the real aims of the Reagan administration, these doubts were dispelled by the salvos of the American naval artillery fired on the Lebanese patriots, the outrages committed on the Lebanese soil by occupiers wearing the uniform of the American Marines.

Such are the real causes of the tragic events in Lebanon. Washington has only one answer for every occasion, the "Soviet threat" myth, but Mr Weinberger is trying in vain: No turbid streams of lies and slanders against the Soviet Union can conceal these causes and relieve the present administration of the responsibility for what is happening in Lebanon.

U.S. DEMONSTRATORS PROTEST GRENADA 'AGGRESSION'

LD270652 Moscow TASS in English 0215 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 27 TASS -- "U.S., Get Out From Grenada," "Hands Off Central America", "No to New Vietnams" -- under these slogans a mass demonstration of the American public was held Wednesday outside the White House, which had planned and perpetrated an aggression against independent Grenada. Its participants demanded that criminal ventures of the incumbent U.S. Administration be stopped.

Leaflets distributed by demonstrators pointed out that the people of Grenada should be given the right to self-determination.

A mass meeting was held in the Lafayette Park, in front of the White House. Speakers at the meeting strongly condemned the new aggression of Washington in Central America.

U.S. 'MILITARIST' FOREIGN POLICY ASSAILED

PM260921 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Oct 83 p 3

[Article by political observer Yuriy Kornilov under the rubric "View of Events": "Reason Must Prevail"]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan is holding in his hands a nuclear bomb inscribed with...the word "peace." This cartoon by the famous American caricaturist (C. Keller), which was featured on the pages of many foreign papers, exactly expresses the essence of the present Washington administration's foreign policy: its aggressiveness and its hypocrisy.

On 4 November it will be 3 years since Reagan was elected 40th President of the United States. In discussing and analyzing this period in U.S. political life, observers are no longer making forecasts about any possible "evolution" for the better in Washington's foreign policy line. Now, with almost three-fourths of the presidential term over, it is more than obvious that the U.S. ruling class has not come through the test of detente or the rest of peaceful coexistence. This is precisely why we saw put in power the Reaganite "millionaires' government" which reflects the interests of monopoly capital's most reactionary and aggressive circles and thinks in terms not of equality but of superiority. The pivot of its foreign policy line is a gamble on force, an undermining at any price and by any means the approximate military-strategic parity that has arisen in Europe and the world, and, after acquiring military superiority, on "pressurizing" socialism and recarving the political map of the planet.

The global imperial designs of U.S. ruling circles explain an upsurge of militarism unprecedented even for this imperialist country: Indefatigable hegemonist ambitions underlie Washington's negative and obstructionist approach to today's "problem of problems" -- curbing accelerated material preparations for war. Refusing to condemn nuclear war, blocking and deadlocking the arms race limitation talks, the Washington administration continues as if in a frenzy to increase the pace of the military conveyor belts. A "rearm America" project, on which more than $2 trillion is to be spent over the next 5 years, has been launched. Production programs for all types of weapons -- nuclear, chemical, and conventional -- are being elaborated one after another. Next in line is the creation of a system for combat operations in and from space. The militarist plans and actions are accompanied by the pronouncement of the aggressive concepts of a "first preemptive nuclear strike," and postulates about "limited," "star," and other nuclear wars. Contrary to all reason, contrary to authoritative statements by eminent politicians, military experts, and major scientists, Washington publicly announces that a nuclear duel is not only possible and permissible, but is even "not so terrible." There is not and cannot be any justification for these cannibalistic doctrines and calculations!

In nudging the world toward the dangerous brink of a nuclear catastrophe, U.S. ruling circles are striving to involve the other Western states more deeply in implementing their militarist plans.

The NATO countries, publicly called "equal allies," are increasingly being reduced to the status of "junior partners" whose sovereignty is for Washington just a name and of whom one thing is demanded: unquestioning subordination to "Atlantic solidarity" and blind toeing of the U.S. foreign policy line. The NATO military-political machine is increasingly "involving" Japan, which is given the role of a kind of unsinkable U.S. nuclear aircraft carrier. By cheering those of like mind, intimidating the wavering, and coercing those who disagree, the United States is striving to cobble together something along the lines of a united imperialist bloc to combat world socialism. Washington sees the whipping up of tension as a means to help it stifle the deepening antagonisms within the capitalist system and consolidate its imperial claims to the role of leader of the capitalist world.

U.S. imperialism's militarist "campaign" is spearheaded against the USSR, but it also has a wider political and geographical application. Even according to U.S. data, in the last 6 years alone the Washington administration, publicly declaring virtually the whole planet a "sphere of U.S. vital interests," has resorted to armed action against other states or threatened them with the use of force on 38 occasions. And what dismal, bloody, and shameful pages have been written in the history of U.S. foreign policy by the "Reagan team!" This "team's" score in the Near East includes attempts to push through new anti-Arab deals and complicity in the atrocities of the Zionist aggressor, which is carrying out genocide against the Arabs in the long-suffering land of Lebanon. In Asia, Reagan and Co are continuing their undeclared war against sovereign Afghanistan. In Central and Latin America they support the criminal clique usurping power in El Salvador, protect the Pinochet fascist junta, and continue their provocations against free Cuba. In Africa they watch over the barbaric apartheid regime in South Africa and unceremoniously interfere in the affairs of the Republic of Chad. Under the cover of anticommunism the latter-day pretenders to the role of arbiter of the world's destinies are carrying out international piracy and are attempting to install sympathetic regimes whereever they are not rebuffed.

An integral component of the U.S. militarist line is psychological aggression. In trying somehow to substantiate their dangerous and inhuman policy, the Washington "crusaders" pile up heaps of slander against the Soviet Union and socialism as a social system, and it is none other than Reagan himself who sets the tone both in launching hysterical anti-Soviet campaigns and in the attempts to justify Washington's imperial lust. "The post of president of the country," testifies Gus Hall, leader of the American Communists, "is occupied by a dangerous and wicked ignoramus who proclaims to the whole world that if you are against the nuclear arms race you are not only against Reagan but against God and, moreover, anyone opposing the nuclear arms race is an agent of the Devil himself!"

In analyzing the reasons for the sharp intensification of aggressive tendencies in U.S. foreign policy, observers note that the White House's gamble on force also reflects the desire of the country's ruling circles to overcome the profound and increasingly acute domestic socioeconomic contradictions by way of an arms race and foreign policy adventures. In the sphere of economics the sum total after nearly 3 years of the present U.S. Administration's stay in power is lamentable: The situation in a number of major sectors remains critical; the budget deficit is still enormous; the army of wholly and partially unemployed, according to the latest data from the U.S. AFL-CIO labor union association, has reached 18 million people; more than 30 million American citizens live "below the poverty line"; and over 2 million have no roof over their heads....

"America is getting back into the saddle!," Reagan proclaimed in January 1981, having in mind the ambitious plans for the country's "economic improvement." Today Washington is forced into the realization that the "Republican horse" is far from having extricated the United States from the quagmire of "goddamn problems"...

But the present Washington administration's global hegemonist lust and its potential are far from being one and the same thing! However, the U.S. ruling circles strive to achieve military superiority and whatever new mountains of weapons they build up, they are not succeeding -- nor will they -- in getting an inch nearer their goal. The Soviet Union does not seek a "trial of strength," but no one should take the USSR's goodwill and its desire to come to an agreement as a sign of weakness. As the CPSU Central Committee Politburo recently stressed quite definitely, the Soviet Union is capable of making the appropriate response to any attempt by the U.S.-NATO side to implement their dangerous schemes, and its words are never at variance with its deeds.

However, this course of events is not our choice: The USSR, in striving to live in peace with all countries including the United States, is a principled opponent of the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. Our country is countering Washington's attempts to further exacerbate international tension and destabilize the situation in the world with a range of large-scale peace initiatives that are gaining the increasingly broad support of the peoples. The fact that the detente policy possesses solid reserves of life forces is proved with utter cogency both by the results of the Madrid meeting and by an antiwar movement uprecedented in scope and mass appeal, which is increasingly surging upward even in the United States itself. The imperialists' pathetic stabs at expansionism are encountering a mounting rebuff in Africa, Asia, Central and Latin America, and throughout the world.

No, no one can turn back the objective process of world development! "Reason must triumph. The choice must be made in favor of strengthening universal peace, security, and cooperation between peoples." All the planet's sober-minded people are in complete solidarity with these words from the statement by the CEMA heads of government.

S. KOREA WAR PREPARATIONS 'BRAZEN THREAT'

SK270237 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] South Korean dictator Chon Tu-hwan has declared a program for large-scale war preparations that will deepen confrontation in this region. He said that South Korea will make best efforts to establish a powerful military system. He also said that the production of a new type weaponry system will be increased.

Mobile exercises by the South Korean Armed Forces and U.S.-South Korean joint military exercises have been frequently staged.

Chon Tu-hwan's remarks were full of brazen threat to the DPRK.

DPRK PRESENTS CITATIONS TO SOVIET TECHNICIANS

SK260118 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Text] Soviet technicians who had participated in the expansion work of Kim Chaek Iron Works recently received citations from the Government of People's Korea.

Presenting the citations to the Soviet technicians, Comrade Pak Song-chol, one of the DPRK leaders, said that they have greatly contributed to the friendship between the two countries.

OFFICIAL INDIAN-PRC TALKS RESUME IN DELHI

PM261129 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "India-PRC; Talks in Delhi"]

[Text] Delhi, 25 Oct -- The scheduled fourth round of official Indian-Chinese talks has begun here.

It is reported that the sides intend to continue their discussion of questions relating to the border and the development of bilateral relations trade, culture, science, and technology, and to exchange views on international questions of mutual interest.

GROMKYO MEETS WITH NEW INDIAN AMBASSADOR

LD262117 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- Andrey Gromkyo, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has today received in the Kremlin newly appointed ambassador of the Republic of India, Sayid Nurul Hasan.

During their conversation the ambassador expressed satisfaction with having been appointed to represent the Republic of India in the Soviet Union. He said that the Indian Government and the entire people of the country viewed relations between the USSR and India as relations of friendship in politics, in economic and trade contacts and from the point of view of assistance in strengthening India's defences.

The ambassador further stressed the great importance of the Nonaligned Movement, in particular, of the decisions taken by it at the recent nonaligned summit in New Delhi.

The ambassador also emphasized the exceptional importance of contacts between statesmen of the two countries, especially at the highest level.

Replying to the statements made by the Indian ambassador, Andrey Gromkyo, speaking on behalf of the Soviet leadership as a whole, expressed great satisfaction with the successful extension of relations between the Soviet Union and India. He stressed that the two countries have travelled a long road since the time the banner of independence was raised over India. The Soviet Union intends to continue to strengthen its relations with India both in politics and in economic, cultural and other affairs. Andrey Gromkyo emphasized specifically the importance of cooperation between the Soviet Union and India on the international scene in the interests of detente and the removal of the threat of nuclear war.

Touching upon the Nonaligned Movement and India's role in it, Andrey Gromkyo also noted the Soviet Union's continuous support for the Nonaligned Movement and in particular for the decisions taken by the nonaligned summit in New Delhi.

The Soviet Union is willing to cooperate in future with nonaligned countries and with all the other peaceable states in the struggle for peace among nations.

The conversation passed in a warm friendly atmosphere.

ALIYEV LEAVES FOR HANOI; SEEN OFF BY GRISHIN

PM271049 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] A Soviet party and government delegation, led by Geydar Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, left Moscow for Hanoi today for an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The delegation includes Comrade Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Tereshkova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee; and Comrade Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

At the airport the delegation was seen off by Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Comrade Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR Ministers T.B. Guzhenko, V.A. Dinkov, I.P. Kazanets, N.T. Kozlov; N.W. Smirnovskiy, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Section; B.I. Aristov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

SRV Charge d'Affaires Ad Interim in the USSR Nguyen Van Guang was also among the send-off party.

Stopover in Tashkent

GF261514 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1315 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] The party and state delegation led by Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, heading for the SRV on an official visit, stopped over in Tashkent today. The delegation consists of (Arishkov), secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Tereshkova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the committee of Soviet women; and Comrade Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the SRV.

Comrade Aliyev and other members of the delegation were met at Tashkent Airport by Comrade Rashidov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee; members of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee; and other officials.

CPCZ PRESIDIUM STATEMENT ON MISSILES PUBLISHED

PM261230 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "CPCZ Central Committee Presidium Statement"]

[Text] Prague, 25 Oct -- The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has published a statement which reads:

The struggle for peace and to avert war constitutes the basis of the policy of the CPCZ, the CSSR Government, and the Warsaw Pact states. This is confirmed in the Political Declaration adopted at the conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee in Prague. It points to the very serious danger posed to European peoples by the NATO bloc's intentions to deploy new U.S. medium-range missiles on the territory of a whole number of West European countries.

The Prague Political Declaration contains an extensive action program aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war, easing international tension, reducing arms, and disarmament on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security.

Despite these weighty peace appeals, the United States has not displayed the slightest desire to hold earnest talks on these questions and to reach agreement. It does not react to the proposals contained in the political declaration but ignores and distorts them, seeking to gain time for the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles already at the end of this year.

In its statement of 28 May 1983, the Soviet Government was compelled to give a reminder that if the U.S. and NATO decision regarding the deployment of new U.S. missiles in West Europe starts to be implemented, then the Soviet Union will be compelled to take necessary measures in agreement with the other Warsaw Pact states for the defense of the Soviet Union and its allies.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government emphasized in the statement of 3 June 1983 that, conscious of their responsibility for the Czechoslovak people's peaceful and calm life, they share that statement and voice full support for it.

In the joint statement adopted in Moscow 28 June this year, the socialist countries' leading party and state figures once again addressed with great urgency a broad peace program to the NATO states' governments and urged them to hold talks and reach agreements. At the same time they emphasized that, in the interests of peace and their own security, in no circumstances will they permit anyone to achieve military superiority over them.

The world public knows that it is precisely the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that in the spirit of their principled Leninist peace-loving policy, filled with humanism, and seeking the happiness of mankind, regularly put forward proposals for preserving world peace and averting nuclear catastrophe. The most reactionary imperialist forces -- the United States above all -- ignore the peoples' will and continuously build up the arms race, seeking to upset the equilibrium, to achieve superiority, and to hold talks from a "position of strength."

Czechoslovakia cannot view passively the fact that not far from its western borders the United States is rapidly completing the preparations to deploy medium-range missiles. In the interests of the security of our motherland and the socialist community, the Czechoslovak Government together with the USSR Government have adopted a decision to begin preparatory work for the deployment of operational-tactical missile complexes.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government are convinced that the Czechoslovak people will fully support these unavoidable measures.

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED ON HONECKER-HUSAK TALKS

PM261228 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Strengthening Fraternal Alliance"]

[Text] Prague, 25 Oct -- One of the most important tasks at the present time is to take urgent measures to help end the arms race and reach an agreement on limiting and reducing armed forces and arms, emphasizes the communique on the results of the friendly visit to Czechoslovakia of E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and on his talks with G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR.

The two fraternal countries' leaders noted the very great significance of the socialist community's peace proposals advanced at the Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee and the Moscow meeting of the socialist countries' leading party and state figures. The NATO states must reply to these peace initiatives -- which would make it possible to embark upon concrete talks, including concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states.

The deepening of comradely cooperation with the Soviet Union and the strengthening of the socialist community's unity and cohesion are the chief precondition for preserving peace on earth, the communique points out. In this connection the sides emphasized the great significance of the Warsaw Pact states' joint actions.

Czechoslovakia and the GDR consider the present situation in Europe particularly dangerous for the cause of peace, the document states. In the event of the deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in West Europe, the sides will take all the necessary measures in the interests of ensuring their security and defending the socialist community. In the light of these facts, the CSSR and GDR governments together with the Soviet Government have decided to begin preparatory work for the deployment of operational-tactical missile complexes.

The CSSR and GDR leaders resolutely advocated activating talks on a whole package of questions relating to limiting and reducing arms. They consider it particularly important for all nuclear powers to follow the USSR's example and adopt a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear war as the most shameful crime against mankind. The sides voiced support for the USSR's constructive proposals at the Geneva talks while at the same time condemning the U.S. stand at them.

SHEVARDNADZE, ZIMYANIN RECEIVE GDR'S STIEF

PM250945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Familiarization With Work Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of the Committee of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate of the GDR headed by A. Stief, member of the SED Central Committee and minister and chairman of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate Committee, was in the Soviet Union.

The delegation familiarized itself with the work experience of people's control organs in our country. They had talks at the USSR People's Control Committee and the Georgian SSR People's Control Committee and met with people's control workers at a number of enterprises in industry and agriculture. In the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee the delegation had a meeting with E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee [title as published].

The delegation of the GDR Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate Committee was received by M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Taking part in the warm, friendly talk were A.M. Shkolnikov, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, as well as W. Grabowski, GDR charge d'affaires in the USSR.

COMPARISON OF GDR DEFENSE COUNCIL STATEMENT

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 26 October carries in its First Edition on page 4 a TASS report entitled "GDR National Defense Council Report." The version published in PRAVDA has been compared to the TASS in English version published under the subhead "GDR Defense Council Statement" on page F 1 of the 25 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, revealing the following variations:

First paragraph, last line in PRAVDA reads: ...have been distributed here:

In full accord... (omitting "today" and the second paragraph in its entirety)

Third paragraph, line two in PRAVDA reads: ... deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles... (omitting "U.S.")

Fourth paragraph, last line in PRAVDA reads: ...armaments, and disarmament.

In connection with the fact that the United... (rewording)

Penultimate paragraph, penultimate line in PRAVDA reads: ...territory for deploying operational-tactical missile complexes.

The steps being... (rewording)

Last paragraph, penultimate line in PRAVDA reads: ...equilibrium in nuclear means between the Warsaw... (substituting "means" for "systems")

CORRECTION TO COMPARISON OF TIKHONOV DEPARTURE

The following correction pertains to the item published under the headline "Comparison of Item on Tikhonov Berlin Departure" on page F 7 of the 25 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Penultimate paragraph, penultimate and final lines should read: ...Council of Ministers; M.S. Smirtyukov, administrator of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials, (supplying dropped passage)

ACTION IN GRENADA CONDEMNED IN UK PARLIAMENT

LD270259 Moscow TASS in English 0127 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] London October 26 TASS -- Can President Reagan be trusted at all? This is how the question on further relations between Britain and the United States was raised during the extraordinary debates in the House of Commons of British Parliament today. The debates were held on the demand of the Labour opposition in connection with the United States aggression against a sovereign state, Grenada. Speakers expressed concern over even more horrible consequences to which this conduct of international affairs that has become normal for the present U.S. Administration can lead. They stressed that unilateral actions of the White House will become particularly dangerous after U.S. cruise missiles are deployed on the territory of Western Europe, specifically in Britain.

Prominent leader of the Labour opposition Denis Healey said that the United States committed an unjustifiable aggression against Grenada, the aggression which threatens with serious consequences the cause of peace. He accused the Thatcher cabinet that it had been aware of the planned invasion but concealed this from Parliament and the British people. Healey said that in the light of the present actions of the Reagan administration Britain must consider most seriously the question of control over using U.S. cruise missiles that are planned to be deployed in Britain.

The national Executive Committee of the Labour Party adopted a special resolution which sharply condemned the United States' aggression against Grenada and demanded the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenada.

MOSCOW REPORTS ON BUSH TRIP TO LEBANON

LD261526 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] U.S. Vice President George Bush has arrived in Lebanon. The commander of the U.S. Marine Corps, Paul Kelly, is already in Beirut. These visits are connected with the plans of the Reagan administration to use the incident involving the death of a large number of American Marines in Beirut to extend U.S. military interference in Lebanon. New groups of warships are heading for the shores of the country.

U.S. TRIES TO 'LINK' MOSCOW WITH BEIRUT BLASTS

U.S. Envoy's 'Base Slander'

PM261522 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Krivopalov "Rejoinder": "Slander to Order"]

[Text] Paris -- E. Galbraith, U.S. ambassador to France, a habitue of Parisian diplomatic and political salons, is also persistently trying to "take root" in the mass media. Reagan's emissary frequently appears on French television. Everything indicates that the ambassador is invested with extraordinary powers, including those needed to orchestrate pro-U.S. propaganda in his country of residence. He has already frequently set the tone for anti-Soviet campaigns mounted on the banks of the Seine.

The latest broadcast attack by the diplomat, who has a most idiosyncratic perception of his official mission, was mounted after the news of the Beirut explosions, as a result of which the buildings housing the headquarters of the U.S. French contingents in Lebanon were destroyed. Speaking on an Antenne-2 television program, Galbraith indicated to U.S.-oriented propagandists in France what they should say in this situation and how to say it.

Paul (Jaon), chief of the Antenne-2 foreign desk, spoke on the same evening in the tone set by the American. The "independent" observer did not burden his commentary with arguments or propositions. He simply repeated the words of the U.S. ambassador. The slander was in circulation. It was echoed by several other commentators on French television, which, incidentally, is under government control. The Paris newspapers continued the U.S. ambassador's line in an even more unbridled and crude form.

But despite the shrill, brazen falsification, immoral in the supreme sense of the word, sober opinions regarding the possible organizers of the acts of sabotage in Beirut were nonetheless heard in the French press. For instance, it is hard to deny the logic of some of the arguments of S. July, editor of LIBERATION. In whose interests were the terrorists acting? he asks. And he replies: "Was this not an incitement to escalation; an attempt to push the United States to become even more deeply bogged down in the Lebanon crisis and to send in the Rapid Deployment Force and risk unleashing war?"

It is not for nothing that many people in Paris have drawn attention to the cries of "Stop, thief" which have been issued so hurriedly from Tel Aviv.

Blast Used as 'Pretext'

LD261757 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Paris October 26 TASS -- Correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reporting:

Evan Galbraith, U.S. ambassador to France, permitted himself a dirty anti-Soviet insinuation. Speaking in an interview with the French television program Antenne-2, he alleged that the Soviet Union was involved in the recent terrorist acts in Beirut which claimed the lives of U.S. and French soldiers from the so-called "multinational force".

It is appropriate to ask if the U.S. ambassador has any hard facts to substantiate his monstrous accusation. No he doesn't. And he was quick in admitting that himself. Moreover, there can be no such facts, as the Soviet Union -- and the leaders of our country have repeatedly said so -- is a principled enemy of terrorism as an instrument of international politics. As to Lebanon in particular, the USSR holds that the situation there can be settled in line with the interests of the Lebanese people only by political, peaceful means, not by military force, far less by staging terrorist acts.

In any case one thing is clear: The blood shed Sunday by the young men clothed in U.S. and French military uniforms is being used shamelessly as a pretext for playing up a propaganda campaign the purpose of which is to drum up support for a sharp buildup of Western, predominantly U.S., "presence" in Lebanon.

Mr Galbraith, to be sure, perfectly knows it all. His disinformation duirng a French television appearance is nothing less than a part of that provocative campaign.

AL-QADHDHAFI SCORES U.S. 'AGGRESSION' IN GRENADA

LD262029 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Tripoli October 26 TASS -- The leader of the Libyan revolution, Mu'ammar al'Qadhdhafi, has demanded the immediate termination of the U.S. aggression against the people of Grenada and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the sovereign state. The treacherous actions of the U.S. Administration, which is using force against the independent state -- member of the international community -- is an unprecedented violation of the existing norms and laws and a vivid manifestation of the policy of terror and violence pursued by Washington in the international arena, he stressed in a message sent to the U.N. secretary general and the heads of the U.N. member countries. Al-Qadhdhafi urged the international community to take urgent measures for stopping the barbarous aggression and curbing the aggressor.

RELATIONS, COOPERATION WITH PDRY PRAISED

LD261410 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1730 GMT 25 Oct 83

[Unattributed talk on the fourth anniversary of the USSR-PRDY friendship and cooperation treaty]

[Text] In his speech at the CPSU Central Committee session in June (?1983), Yuriy Andropov, secretary general of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, said that the countries which have chosen the socialist course in the former colonialist world are the closest countries to us. The common peaceful and anti-imperialist goals and [words indistinct] of social justice and progress bring us together with these countries.

These words by Andropov refer to those countries [words indistinct] including the PDRY. Relations between the two countries are relations of allies in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, and for international detente and social progress.

Today the Soviet and PDRY people celebrate the fourth anniversary of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the PDRY, which was signed 25 October and expressed the will of the workers of our two countries in consolidating the struggle and (?comrade) solidarity between them. Article seven of the treaty stipulates that our two countries will in the future also do their utmost to defend world peace and peoples' security and consolidate international detente and spread it all over to world and also to (?embody) it in certain forms of cooperation based on mutual interest and settling disputed matters by peaceful means so as to [word indistinct] the principle of the use of force in international life and to liquidate all forms of the policy of domination and expansion in the world.

The Soviet-PDRY cooperation, which is based on a firm foundation of the unity of political viewpoints on pressing issues of today and also on [word indistinct], today covers several fields. Fraternal relations between the CPSU and the [word indistinct] party are being consolidated every year. Relations between parliaments and social and trade unionist organizations in our two countries have been [word indistinct]. Various projects have been built and continue to be built in the PDRY with Soviet economic and technical aid. Among these are the dam network in [word indistinct], tens of artesian wells, water storage tanks which brought water to areas where it used to be impossible to cultivate, tractor and agricultural machinery repair workshops, a fish canning factory and others.

All these projects contribute to resolving one of the more pressing issues facing the economy of the young independent state, namely, raising the people's living standard. The Mukalla fish canning plant, which produces 1.5 million cans every year, and the fishing harbor in Aden are among the great projects of Soviet-Yemeni cooperation. A thermoelectrical station is being constructed in Aden which will operate the desalinization system, making it possible to supply drinking water to Aden and neighboring areas. The Soviet Union assists the PDRY in building plans for the production of [word indistinct] concrete cement and the construction of a hospital. These projects will become operational in the near future.

It is very important for this young state that all the Soviet-Yemeni cooperation projects are regarded a real school for the national cadres, as thousands of Yemeni youth are getting various trades.

Our two countries have accumulated a rich experience of cooperation in planning economic development and utilizing national resources and [word indistinct] the cultural and historic heritage of the people of the PDRY. Tutors from the Soviet Union teach at the Aden University.

With the help of Soviet experts, the national folk troupe, which have performances several times in the USSR, was set up. The Soviet-Yemeni friendship weeks have become a tradition. Ali Nasir Muhammad, secretary General of the Central Committee of the Yemeni Socialist Party and president of the People's Supreme Council, pointed out in his speech at the 26th Congress of the CPSU the fruitful and comprehensive nature of relations between the two countries, saying that these relations are regarded as the most important factor in developing and consolidating the revolutionary process in our country, and also in consolidating the unity of the anti-imperialist forces. The same idea was expressed at the meeting at the end of September this year between Andropov and Ali Nasir Muhammad in Moscow. The two leaders pointed out with satisfaction the development of successful bilateral relations, the relations which are based on the firm basis of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the two countries.

PONOMAREV RECEIVES ANC GENERAL SECRETARY

LD261609 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow, October 26 TASS -- Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Rostislav Ulyanovskiy, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, have today received at the CPSU Central Committee a delegation of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa led by ANC General Secretary Alfred Nzo.

Alfred Nzo described the struggle waged by the South African people against the apartheid regime and the ANC efforts to unite the patriotic forces of the country in a single national liberation front. He cordially thanked the CPSU and the Soviet people for their support to the fighters for the freedom of South Africa and spoke highly of the foreign policy initiatives of the USSR aimed at safeguarding and strengthening peace, removing the threat of thermonuclear war and ending the arms race.

The representatives of the CPSU for their part described the dedicated work of the Soviet people to fulfill the decision of the 26th party congress and subsequent plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee. They voiced solidarity with the just struggle waged by the ANC and demanded the release of all the opponents of racism who are languishing in South African prisons.

The participants in the meeting noted that the joint actions of the peace forces on all continents were needed to give a rebuff to the aggressive policy of the imperialist forces led by the United States. They denounced the reactionary alliance of Washington and Pretoria, voiced support for Angola, Mozambique and other "frontline" African countries exposed to the armed attacks of the South African racists, and spoke in favor of the immediate independence for Namibia.

The meeting passed in a warm friendly atmosphere.

MOSCOW ON SOMALIA SINCE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

LD222003 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 22 Oct 83

[Text] Fourteen years ago on 21 October a revolution took place in Somalia. Aleksandr (Kelin) gives these details:

Fourteen years separates us from that time when the revolutionary wing of the Somali army brought down the corrupt, pro-imperialist regime. A new government that came to power declared that an end would be put in Somalia to poverty, backwardness, social injustice and oppression. Somalia, it said, would be oriented to a socialist way of development. The domestic and foreign policy of the new government received support of the broader sections of the Somali people.

I recall television broadcasts from Somalia that showed happy faces of participants in meetings and demonstrations and people's working enthusiasm. Literally, every month news reached us about the appearance of more schools, hospitals and children's institutions in that country; about social and economic reforms carried out in the interests of the working people. There were certain difficulties of course in the way of Somalia's development: the shortage of finances, resources and specialists, unfavorable weather conditions and many others. But the people of the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state, came to Somalia's help in overcoming these sometimes disastrous difficulties.

Loyal to its internationalist duty and the principles of proeltarian solidarity the Soviet Union was rendering enormous assistance to Somalia.

Describing it, President Mohamed Siad Barre declared in his speech at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party that the people of Somalia, overwhelmed by their feeling of deep gratitude for the help and support extended to them, have inscribed in golden letters in their history the words about friendship with the Soviet Union.

Regretfully, much has changed ever since in Somalia. Its government has actually given up the anti-imperialist course in foreign policy. It is now promoting a military cooperation with the United States, that is, with a country which is considered only recently the number one enemy of free Africa. It allowed the use of Somali territory for American military bases and carried out a series of joint maneuvers with the United States. Somalia denounced a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. The work was stopped at a number of projects that were of national importance. Moreoever, as the ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, Siad Barre, after mastering Reagon's recipe of the economic restoration, adopted a liberalization policy in the economy. This means that the door will be open wide in Somalia for foreign business interests. A study is being made now in Mogadishu as to which of the nationalized enterprises may be sold to private owners, including foreign. This is despite the fact that the damaging consequences of activities of western monopolies in Africa are well known. They cannot help but have their detrimental effect on the country's social, economic and political orientation, on the choice of its orientation.

Indicative of this is the statement by the Director General of the Somali Foreign Ministry, Hashi Abdallah Farah. We, he said, run against tremendous difficulties while switching from one system to another, but we have chosen our way. Earlier that was a socialist way, now it can only be a capitalist way and a pro-imperialist way at that for history provides no examples of any other alternative. The Somali leadership, as you may see, have spoken up in favor of the second. Well, it has every right to do that, but in the long run the vitality of any course is determined by the amount of support that it receives from the people. The scale of antigovernment opposition in Somalia testifies to the opposite.

Fourteen years after the revolution, Somalia has found itself standing on the crossroads. Conveying my best greetings to the people of Somalia on their anniversary, I'd like to wish them to make a step in the right direction that would bring them prosperity, happiness and well-being.

USSR 'FIRMLY CONDEMNS' U.S. ACTION IN GRENADA

PM271004 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

["TASS statement"]

[Text] -- An armed intervention against Grenada, a sovereign independent state, was perpetrated on October 25. American troops landed on the island with the support of United States combat ships. The intrusion was effected under the false pretext of ensuring the safety of American citizens in Grenada although it is well known -- and this was directly stated by the Grenadian authorities -- that nothing threatens them. At the same time Washington contends that its actions are supposedly motivated by concern for "human rights."

What can be more cynical and hypocritical than such statements when under the pretext of concern for "human rights" an attempt is being made to drown in blood the right of a whole people to free and sovereign existence! What is happening in reality is an outright armed aggression against a peace-loving people of a small country that is not threatening anyone with anything. The aim of this is the overthrow the social system existing there. This is an attempt to impose by force upon the Grenadian people a system suiting Washington, to intimidate not only them, but the other freedom-loving peoples of Latin America.

By its actions in respect of Grenada the Government of the United States of America demonstrates its full disregard for the general accepted norms of international law and tramples into dirt the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter. This is direct evidence of the fact that for the sake of attaining its aims of conquest Washington does not intend to respect the right of peoples to independent development, and is openly and brazenly challenging the will of the peoples and world public opinion.

The bandit attack on Grenada shows with total clarity the danger posed to the cause of peace and the freedom of peoples by the course pursued in international affairs by the present American Administration.

TASS is authorized to state that the Soviet Union firmly condemns the United States aggression against Grenada and stigmatizes it as a crime against peace and humanity. It is the duty of all states and peoples firmly to come out against Washington's artbirariness and lawlessness, in defense of the Grenadian people.

The aggression against the people of Grenada of the Grenadian must be stopped, the occupationists must immediately clear out from that independent state.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON EVENTS IN GRENADA

'Big Naval Groupings'

LD270548 Moscow TASS in English 0456 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 27 TASS -- The United States, which is giving greater scope to the armed aggression against revolutionary Grenada, has concentrated a big naval grouping led by the aircraft carrier "Independence" near the shores of that small island state in the Caribbean.

According to a report of the newspaper NEWSDAY, Grenada has been taken in pincers by eleven combatant ships of the U.S. Navy. Apart from the aircraft carrier the squadron includes a missile- carrying cruiser, a missile-carrying frigate and three destroyers. The amphibious ship "Guam" is also near the island's coast. Marine units which have been brought precisely by this ship were helicoptered to the airport for its seizure.

82d Airborne Arrival

LD262243 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has admitted in an interview with the NBC television company that units of the 82d Airborne Division have already been transferred to Grenada. They should be taking the place of Marines who landed on the island yesterday. The transfer of units of the 82d Division to Grenada is being evaluated by observers as testimony to the fact that the aggressors are not yet successful in reaching the aims set down in their commands.

'Invaders' Facing Rebuff

LD270132 Moscow TASS in English 0002 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Georgetown October 26 TASS -- According to the latest news bulletin of the Voice of Barbados radio station, the invaders failed to fulfill the plans of the U.S. command and to assume full control of Grenada by noon today. The revolutionary armed forces and Grenadian resistance fighters continue to offer strong rebuff to the invaders. The main center of fighting has shifted to Shenin, one of the densely populated suburbs of the Grenadian capital. The district with its tortuous streets enables the defenders to ambush invading troops. The invaders also do not risk attacking Fort Frederick, a center of resistance of the Grenadian Armed Forces that is situated atop a hill.

According to the Barbados radio station, the resistance forces are also making effective counterattacks, and one of such daring operations today all but ended with the capture of Grenada's Governor General Paul Scoon, whom the invaders plan to install in power in the country after they have assumed full control of the situation.

New York October 26 TASS -- Quoting "Western diplomats" in Bridgetown, Barbados, UPI reports that fierce street fighting continues in the Grenadian capital of Saint Georges between troops of the People's Revolutionary Army of Grenada and U.S. troops, the defenders continue firing at the invaders from positions between buildings in the city. The invaders are suffering losses.

'Last' Cuban Stronghold Falls

LD270037 Moscow TASS in English 0027 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 26 TASS -- The latest emergency statement of the Cuban Government on the events in Grenada reports that contact with the Cuban builders and specialists in Grenada, offering heroic resistance to the U.S. aggressors, has completely broken off.

The invaders used all the means available to them, including fighter planes, helicopters, mortars and large-bore artillery guns, in their latest attacks on the Cuban positions, the statement points out.

According to a report of the Cuban Embassy in Grenada, the last stronghold defended by Cuban specialists fell at 11:17 a.m. (local time), the document says. Its last six defenders, having wrapped themselves up in the Cuban flag, fought to the end. They did not surrender and sacrificed their lives for the homeland, the statement reads.

Retribution to the aggressors and their puppets, whatever region they may turn out to be in, will be inevitable. This is beyond doubt.

Cuba on U.S. 'Bombing'

LD261928 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 26 TASS -- A statement of the Government of Cuba circulated on October 26 says:

Today at dawn a camp of Cuban building workers in Grenada was attacked from various directions by six U.S. helicopters. Some time later Americans began to shell it from recoilless guns, mortars and other artillery pieces. Then the camp was raised by fighter planes. U.S. warplanes subjected the Cuban camp to heavy bombing. The only big building on its territory which was used as a shelter was destroyed practically to the full. Casualties are numerous, but those who remain alive continue the resistance.

LATIN AMERICAN LEADERS COMMENT ON GRENADA

Castro Statement Cited

LD261153 Moscow TASS in English 1133 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 26 TASS -- First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, President of the State Council and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba Fidel Castro today made a statement of the Communist Party and the Government of Cuba in connection with the U.S. imperialist intervention in Grenada.

The document firmly denounces the U.S. criminal perfidious aggression against one of the tiniest countries in the world -- Grenada. The document gives a well-reasoned rebuff to actions unprecedented in the practice of international relations on the part of the United States, which used crack military units against the outnumbered civilian Cuban personnel who are rendering disinterested internationalist aid to the people of Grenada.

The statement points to the falsity, cynicism and unprincipledness of the stand of the American authorities towards Cuba and Grenada.

The Communist Party and the government emphasised once again that Cuba has firmly adhered and adheres to the policy of absolute non-interference of any form in internal affairs of other states, in this specific case -- into Grenada's inter-party and inter-state affairs.

The responsibility for the aggression and its consequences is laid on American imperialism and its flunkeys.

In conclusion the statement highly appreciates the heroism and courage of Cuban internationalists in Grenada, who, on being suddenly attacked by aggressors, courageously continue defending their principles and honour of their motherland.

OAS Condemnation

LD262019 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, October 26 TASS -- Fernando Salazar Paredez of Bolivia, chairman of the standing committee of the Organisation of American States, condemned U.S. armed intervention in Grenada. Any intervention regardless of its motivation is an obvious violation of the U.N. Charter, expressly forbidding the armed intervention of one country in the affairs of another, he said. No state or group of states has the right to intervene directly or indirectly, under any pretext, in the internal or external affairs of other countries. The above principle forbids not only the use of armed force but any other form of intervention or threat to sovereign states.

Mexico's 'Deep Concern'

LD270609 Moscow TASS in English 0111 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Mexico October 26 TASS -- The Government of Mexico has denounced the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada. An official statement of the Mexican Government circulated here points out the impermissibility of the violation of the principal norms of international coexistence. The statement stresses that only the people of Grenada have the right to determine the forms of their government, without any foreign interference.

It expresses deep concern of the Mexican Government over the landing of foreign military contingents in Grenada, since, as the document underlines, it will aggravate even more the political situation in the Caribbean Basin and in Central America and will create a new danger for peaceful coexistence of the region's countries.

Guyana Hits 'Immoral' Invasion

LD270016 Moscow TASS in English 0004 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Georgetown October 26 TASS -- Guyana's President Forbes Burnham sharply condemned the U.S. aggression against Grenada. He proclaimed that the question of that illegal and immoral invasion of a sovereign Caribbean state will be put to discussion in Guyana's National Assembly (parliament). He pointed out that the government intends to inform members of the Nonaligned Movement of Guyana's principled stand on that matter.

Forbes Burnham demanded an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Grenada and said: Grenada now, Guyana tomorrow, somebody else might be next.

The Grenadian people has our sympathies and support, Forbes Burnham said.

Guyana will speak in the United Nations Security Council from the positions that the U.S. aggression against Grenada is an illegal and immoral invasion, he said in conclusion.

Burnham Praises Resistance

LD270731 Moscow TASS in English 0703 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Georgetown October 27 TASS -- President Forbes Burnham of Guyana has assessed the courageous resistance of the Grenadians as a moral victory over the superior-in-strength and much better armed aggressor. Speaking at a press conference here, the leader of Guyana turned down the attempts by the U.S. Administration and a number of governments of Caribbean countries at justifying the invasion of Grenada by their troops by allusions to a "threat to the security" of the member-countries of the Organization of East Caribbean States. The president stated that no political or other differences between governments can serve as a basis for a foreign invasion or for an invitation to a third state for joint intervention against a sovereign country. He emphasized that the aggression against Grenada is a breach of international law, the U.N. Charter and the U.N. declaration dated 1981 on inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of states and on protection of their independence and sovereignty. He stressed that the United States is an active participant in the breach.

Mr Burnham pointed out that the aggression against Grenada has put in jeopardy the existence of the Caribbean Community (Caricom). He said he has already begun consultations with some of his colleagues on the question of a possible suspension of the activities of the community.

Ecuadoran Denunciation

LD260939 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Quito October 26 TASS -- "The Government of Ecuador, defending the principles of peaceful coexistence, which are contained in the charters of the United Nations and the organisation of American States, which prohibit the use of force in international relations, denounces the military aggression which was staged by the United States against Grenada, which further aggravated the conflict situation in the Caribbean Basin, runs a statement of the Foreign Minister of Ecuador Luis Valencia Rodriguez for the press. The Government of Ecuador calls for an immediate end to foreign occupation.

U.S. 'HEGEMONISTIC' POLICY REAFFIRMED IN GRENADA

LD262108 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 26 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpt] The topical nature of the warning of the danger of the aggressive, adventurist policy of American imperialism is being vividly reaffirmed by the events of recent days and hours. As you know, comrades, the United States has embarked upon direct aggression against revolutionary Grenada. Units of the American Marines, with support from the air and artillery fire from ships of the U.S. Navy, have landed on this small island state in the Caribbean Sea. The landing of the American troops was carried out under the pretext of restoring law and order on the island and to protect the security of American citizens on Grenada. This was President Reagan's explanation. After the event, several hours after the start of the intervention, he informed the American Congress of it.

But could anyone be happy with such -- pardon the expression -- explanations? Isn't this a justification for any American aggression? And how many such aggressive acts of the American military have already been carried out in Central America? There was the intervention by the same American Marines in Guatemala in 1954, in the Dominican Republic in 1965, up to the present undeclared United States' war against Nicaragua.

In Washington they would like to see all of Central America, as they put it there, as the United States' backyard. Such is the cynical, hegemonistic claim to create tyranny and lawlessness in international affairs.

All this was the subject of a session of the UN Security Council which was urgently convened at the demand of the Nicaraguan Government to discuss the question of U.S. aggression against Grenada. [representatives from Nicaragua and other countries are shown at the Security Council Session] Representatives of many countries described the invasion as "a most crude violation of the principles of the UN Charter and the norms of international law. There is no justification whatever for these criminal acts," they said.

U.S. INTERVENTION 'FLOUTING' UN CHARTER

LD261948 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

The Reagan administration has ultimately thrown off the mask of a "peace-maker" and a "champion of democracy".

The armed intervention against Grenada has exposed for the whole world to see its real face -- the face of an aggressor. The American Marines, who invaded Grenada, are sowing death and destruction. According to reports reaching from Grenada, more than 700 Grenadians have already been killed.

The mighty imperialist power, which levelled its military force against that small island state, is trampling its independence and sovereignty, destroying its social and state system. But the American President is picturing this monstrous crime as no less than evidence of his concern for the interests of the Grenadian people, the "human rights" and the "lives of innocent people", who are being killed by the American cut-throat paratroopers in cold blood, and for the "restoration of law, order and democracy" in that Caribbean country.

President Reagan's verbiage at the hastily convened press conference in Washington rang as a sacrilege, as an outrage upon common sense, upon the Grenadian people, who became victims of armed violence, upon the whole humankind. There is truly no limit to the hypocrisy and pharisaism of the present Washington leaders. Reagan's "Grenada operation", and now there is not even a shade of doubt that the operation was inspired and masterminded by Washington, exposes the real essence of the notorious American democracy, which the Washington crusaders are trying to plant everywhere where they do not meet with a rebuff, with the bayonets of their Marines.

The U.S. President was trying to picture things as if the decision on the dispatch of the U.S. troops to Grenada was taken "at the request" of a number of Caribbean countries, that the invasion of Grenada is a "collective" action. But this is a sheer lie. Even a spokesman for the U.S. State Department had to admit that Washington had given orders on landing troops in Grenada several days before the emergency meeting of the heads of state of the member countries of the Caribbean community was held in Port of Spain (Trinidad and Tobago), which rubberstamped at Washington's dictation the decision of a "joint" intervention.

This is a pre-planned, prepared in advance large-scale militaristic action by Washington against the independent state of Grenada in order to overthrow the social system existing there and force on its people a system welcome to Washington. The point at issue, and this must be specially stressed, is a direct American armed intervention against the Grenadian people. As far as the symbolic participation in it of east Caribbean states with pro-American puppet regimes is concerned, it is nothing else but a fig leaf, by means of which Washington, as was repeatedly done in the past too, is trying to create a semblance of a so-called "collective [word indistinct].

By launching a direct, totally unprovoked aggression against a state, which is a full-fledged member of the United Nations Organization, the USA has high-handedly flouted the fundamental principle of the U.N. Charter and the generally accepted norms of international law. The Reagan government is demonstrating its contempt for the world community. It has again been borne out that to attain its imperialist aims, to force its diktat on other countries and peoples it places stake only on armed force. The invasion of Grenada is the same notorious "gunboat diplomacy", which U.S. imperialism has been pursuing in the Western Hemisphere since the turn of the century. It is an action of open international brigandage and international terrorism which have been assumed as the main policy tools of the present Washington challengers to the role of rulers of destinies of the world. This policy is also aimed at intimidating the other freedom-loving peoples of Latin America and not only them.

The American aggression against Grenada is an alarm-signal for all countries and peoples. It requires from them an incessant heightening of vigilance in face of the growing aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism, its headquarters in the White House.

It is a grim warning that where the U.S. Armed Forces, above all the contingents of the so-called Rapid Deployment Force are stationed, a fresh American aggression can be launched under any far-fetched pretext of even without any pretext. The U.S. intervention against Grenada is a challenge launched against the entire world community. It is a serious blow to the cause of peace and international security. The Washington administration and President Reagan personally are responsible for the consequences of that bandit action.

Peace-loving mankind stigmatizes the American aggressors and demands that the U.S. interventionist troops and those of its puppets be immediately pulled out of Grenada, and the Grenadian people be allowed to decide their internal affairs without interference from the outside.

REASONS FOR U.S. ATTACK ON GRENADA RIDICULED

LD270158 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 26 Oct 83

[From the "International Diary" program with Vyacheslav Lavrentyev]

[Text] Today, the attention of the information services is rivetted to the tiny island of Grenada in the Caribbean. An armed aggression has been committeed against this sovereign state, a member of the UN and an active participant of the Nonaligned Movement. American warships have blockaded the island, and Marines have landed in Grenada. Although soldiers of six other Caribbean countries were brought into action in the invasion, their participation in the aggression is purely nominal. Not only was the decision to invade taken by the U.S. President, Reagan, but the aggression was carried out by the all-too-well-known American Rapid Deployment force.

In an attempt to justify this completely unprovoked aggression, the U.S. President declared on Tuesday at a White House press conference that five countries of the east Caribbean community, acting on the basis of a mutual security treaty, had asked the United States for help. The treaty provides for collective sanctions in the event of aggression against any member of the community. Grenada, however, has attacked no one and threatened no one, so the aggression against her is fundamentally illegal. Moreover, the United States is not a member of the east Caribbean community, so that Reagan's attempts to give the aggression a juridical basis simply don't bear examination. That version has been worked out by Washington and is meant to justify America's impudent actions to international public opinion, and to the allies of the United States in the blocs who are worried by the levity and irresponsibility with which the American president sometimes takes important decisions. Even British Prime Minister Thatcher advised Reagan to refrain from such action. Thatcher is perfectly familiar with the situation in this former British colony, where there is still a representative of the British crown with the rank of governor general. But Reagan nevertheless decided to do as he pleased.

But official Washington also has another version, aimed at the American public. The invasion of Grenada was undertaken, officials in Washington assert today, for the purpose of ensuring the safety of American citizens living there. Security of U.S. citizens -- how many crimes have been committed in the world by the U.S. military in the name of that security! And is the United States really hotly concerned for the lives and security of its citizens when it organizes military expeditions in various parts of the world? What threat was there to the U.S. citizens in Grenada? I have visited the island four times as a correspondent, traveled all over it from one end to the other, and also met and talked with the Americans who live there. And let me say that the very question, as the White House now poses it, is a mockery of the true state of affairs.

There are, at present, about 800 Americans in Grenada; most of them are living permanently on the island, basking in the tropical climate and the beauties of nature, playing golf and bathing in the sea. They have adapted splendidly to local conditions, and are more like Grenadians than Americans. There are no restrictions on them, or infringements of their rights of any kind, nor has there ever been the smallest hint of any.
There is, in Grenada, a small group of American students. Their parents, worried about rumors of unrest on the island, telephoned their offspring. The sons replied that all was well, and that their lives were not in any danger. So the question arises, why did Reagan send an armada of warships against the tiny state? At the end of last year, at a meeting with the leaders of five Caribbean states friendly to the United States, the American president accused Grenada, along with Nicaragua, Cuba, and the Soviet Union, of spreading the communist virus in the Caribbean. Washington disapproved of the existing regime in Grenada. On 13 March, 1979, the dictator Gairy had been deposed by a group of young patriots; and the country had embarked on the path of independent development, initiating profound socioeconomic reforms in the interests of the whole population of the island. In a little over 4 years a good deal was accomplished: unemployment was reduced considerably, from 49 percent to 14 percent; primary and secondary education became free, as did medical care. New roads were built and electricity and water supplies brought to many of the villages, The republic also began to play an active part in international affairs, joining the Nonaligned Movement, in which it took an anti-imperialist anti-colonial stand.

From the first days of the victory of the revolution in Grenada a secret war against it was begun in the United States. An economic blockade of the island was mounted; obstacles were put in the way of American tourists wishing to go there; the granting of credits to Grenada was blocked. The CIA helped the former dictator to set up and arm a gang of mercenaries; and now it has come to impudent, open aggression.

World reaction to this flagrant violation of the will and destiny of a small state is clear: The majority of the Latin American states have denounced Reagan's action -- Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Cuba. The European NATO allies of the United States -- France, West Germany, Britain, -- have expressed disagreement with Reagan's methods of conducting international politics.

TASS has issued a statement saying that, by its actions towards Grenada, the U.S. Government is demonstrating its total contempt for accepted norms of international law, and is trampling in the mud the high principles of the UN Charter; this is a direct proof that Washington, for the sake of attaining its aims of conquest, does not intend to take into account the right of peoples to autonomous development, and is impudently and openly defying the will of the peoples and world public opinion.

The piratical attack on Grenada shows with the utmost clarity the danger to the cause of peace and freedom of the peoples represented by the course being pursued in international affairs by the present American Administration. TASS declared that the Soviet Union resolutely condemns the U.S. aggression against Grenada and stigmatizes it as a crime against peace and humanity.

The impudent invasion of Grenada by the American imperialists and their henchmen is setting off an echo in Europe that has clearly come as a surprise to the politicians in Washington. The Paris newspaper LIBERATION in an analysis of the political climate that is taking shape under the influence of this intervention, concludes that the landing of U.S. troops in Grenada will not stop the European opponents of war. More than that, says LIBERATION, it is leading to a redoubling of their efforts. That is an opinion one cannot fail to agree with. It is the more notable since the bourgeois mass media are just now doing their utmost to belittle the significance of the antiwar demonstrations in Western Europe and slander the people involved. But the result is the direct opposite of what the ruling circles expected.

FURTHER CRITICISM OF U.S. ROLE IN GRENADA

Reagan Remarks 'Mendacious'

LD262157 Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- TASS commentator Oleg Kolesnikov writes:

The crude act of international terrorism elevated by Washington to the status of government policy is the assessment given by the world public of the occupation of Grenada by the U.S. Marines. The statements by President Reagan about the "peace-making" mission of the U.S. Marines sent by him to that tiny island in the Caribbean strike one as monstrous cynicism.

The American President is trying to justify his actions by the "urgent, official request" from a number of countries of the region which, allegedly, requested the USA to "contribute by common efforts to the restoration of order and democracy" in Grenada. Only after that, Reagan told a press conference in Washington, the decision was taken on the armed U.S. invasion of Grenada.

Reagan's statements are mendacious from beginning to end, and even officials of the American Administration are forced to admit it. As the AP agency reported, a spokesman for the U.S. State Department bluntly said that the administration had passed a decision on the landing of the U.S. troops in Grenada already in the middle of last week, that is several days before an emergency meeting of the Organisation of East Caribbean States was held on Sunday and adopted, under Washington's pressure a decision on "joint actions" against Grenada.

Reagan's statements to the effect that Washington's "determined actions" were caused by the need for "protecting the life of innocent people, including Americans", do not hold water either. CIA officials, the CBS TV company said in this connection, told the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that they had no information on any threat to the American students under training in Grenada or any threat from Grenada to the security of the United States.

There is no need to cite other pronouncements of this kind, all of them most clearly expose the mendacious character of the U.S. President's statements. Suffice it to say that they in the USA have been preparing for the present bandit actions against Grenada throughout all the time, which passed since the victory of the revolution in that country in March 1979. Right after its coming to power the Reagan administration actually declared war on Grenada, whose people embarked on the path of independent development.

The U.S. President himself more than once lashed out against Grenada and tried to present that tiny country as a "threat" to the neighbouring Caribbean states and even against the United States itself. One cannot help remembering in this connection Reagan's "sensational exposures," when he showed as proof the facilities of the international airport not far from the Grenadian capital which were photographed from an American satellite-spy. Two years ago in the course of the "Ocean Venture-81" exercises the details of the landing of the Marines in Grenada were practised. With that aim they chose the Puerto Rican port of Vieques, which as the American press points out, looks like Grenada due to its geographical conditions. The dropping of a paratrooper force and the landing of the Marines in Grenada were rehearsed in the course of other military games of the Pentagon in the Caribbean. It is absolutely obvious that the Pentagon's present-day interventionist adventure had been a pre-planned operation, whose aim is to stifle Grenada's revolutionary process and restore an obedient pro-American regime in the country.

U.S. Congressmen Cited

LD261929 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 26 TASS -- The Washington leaders openly lie and dodge, trying to justify the flagrant act of unprovoked aggression against Grenada -- a tiny insular state that is a member of the United Nations sticking to non-aligned polities, President Ronald Reagan's letters to leaders of the Congress with "justification" of his intervention contain nothing but lies. He repeated in these letters the totally false "arguments" about the alleged threat to the life of U.S. nationals in Grenada, prattled about "democracy" which Washington is bringing in at the end of the bayonets of its Marines. The content of his letters, however, makes it clear that the real objective of the intervention is to overthrow the Grenadian Government, put an end to the revolutionary changes onthe island and install to power a vassal regime which would obediently do what told by the White House. It is indicative that, as the CBS television network reported, even CIA officials told the House Standing Special Committee on Intelligence that they had no information about any "threat" to the U.S. nationals in Grenada.

Just as absurd were the "arguments" used by Secretary of State George Shultz at a specially arranged press conference.

The administration's verbal exercises, however, failed to delude the public and political circles in the United States. The invasion of Grenada, the NBC television network noted, shocked the Congress with which the administration did not even consult.

Congressman Edolphus Towns described the U.S. intervention as an unjustified act of aggression against a sovereign nation. Member of the House of Representatives Edward Markey characterised Washington's piratic actions as a fresh example of "gunboat diplomacy". The Reagan administration reaffirmed that it is seeking to handle diplomatic problems primarily by the force of arms, said Congressmen Don Bonker.

Congressman Walter Fauntroy demanded an immediate end to the aggression and withdrawal of Marines from the island. He stressed that Reagan's hostile actions against Grenada are in sharp contrast with the policy of cooperation pursued by Washington with regard to South Africa and other repressive and sanguinary regimes. The use of military means has become a kind of automatic reflex of the administration when responding to international problems, said prominent American legislator Paul Simon.

Describing the invasion of Grenada as another military adventure of the Reagan administration abroad, he stressed that no one gave the United States the right to remove from power governments it does not like.

The invasion of Grenada demonstrated once again Reagan's dangerous approach, in true cowboy style, to international problems, said Congressman Ronald Dellums. His colleague Mervyn Dymally dismissed Reagan's assertions that the "action" in Grenada was undertaken at the request of several eastern Caribbean nations. Most of these countries not only failed to approach the United Staes with any request, but are opposed to Washington's interference in the affairs of the region, he said. The United States, said Senator A. Specter, is now involved in wars in three parts of the world. A question arises: When will an end be put to U.S. military interference abroad?

More U.S. Legislators Cited

LD262115 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 26 Oct 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The aggression against Grenada has evoked sharp criticism in the United States itself, too Here is a statement by Senator Moynihan, who could in no way be associated with the doves on Capitol hill. This, he said, is an act of war. I did not know that democracy could be restored by bayonets.

A faction of black congressmen has expressed its indignation at the actions of the Reagan administration and demanded the immediate withdrawal of the American troops from Grenada. Claims that the United States embarked on this step allegedly at the request of certain countries of the Caribbean basin, said Congressman Dellums, is nothing other than a cover for the Reagan administration's adventurist polity. Just as false, added another Congressman Dymally, are the claims of the administration that it carried out the invasion of Grenada to protect American citizens there. Judging by all the facts, the congressman stressed, nothing was threatening them.

U.S. "Exploitation' Hit

LD261114 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] According to reports from foreign news agencies the People's Revolutionary Army of Grenada continued throughout yesterday to resist the units of U.S. Marines and Ranger units which have invaded the island. According to the CNN television company, military actions are going on in the center of the capital of Grenada, St Georges. It is reported that the U.S. invasion forces have suffered losses during the fighting. At the microphone is our commentator Gennadiy Vedenyapin:

The world has witnessed a new act of direct aggression by the United States: Aggression against a state which is a member of the United Nations.

Let me recall that yesterday morning U.S. planes dropped landing troops not far from St Georges in the area of the international airport which is under construction. At the same time several U.S. warships appeared near the coast of Grenada. They began firing fiercely on its territory.

The invasion of Grenada was preceded by a conference of heads of government of the Caribbean community at which Jamaica, Barbados, St Lucia and Antigua agreed to engage their troop contingents in an interventionist corps. But it is now no longer any secret that the countries of Caricom took this irresponsible step under pressure from Washington which required their agreement to take part in the intervention in order to conceal its own adventurist policy. In other words, participation in the invasion of troop units from several Caribbean Basin countries is essentially a fig leaf to cover intervention by the United States.

Having made an unprovoked attack on a sovereign state -- revolutionary Grenada -- Washington has again demonstrated to them whole world its total disregard for the UN Charter and for the standards of international law.

Having declared the entire world to be the sphere of its vital interests, the Reagan administration is trying by means of diktat and direct armed intervention to assert its right -- one which nobody has granted it -- to interfere in the affairs of any sovereign state. On the list of shameful adventures are the suppression the revolutionary movement in El Salvador, military interference in Lebanon, the undeclared war against Afghanistan. This list is now being continued by the intervention against Grenada which has long been irritating the White House by its independent anti-imperialist policy.

Washington's long-standing intention to interfere in the revolutionary process of Grenada is confirmed by the news that the decision to invade was taken by Reagan, not after Sunday's appeal by the Organization of East Caribbean States but back in the middle of last week.

The new aggression by the United States has caused indignation not only throughout the progressive world. Washington's unceremonious behavior has shocked even governments in several Western countries. The French Government, for example, has been forced to state that no state or group of states has the right to introduce its troops on to the territory of another state without the appropriate request of the legitimate authorities of the latter.

A group of black U.S. congressmen have expressed indignation at the actions of the Reagan administration and have demanded the withdrawal from Grenada of all U.S. troops. They have warned of the extremely dangerous consequences of the criminal action by the White House which sees Central America and the region of the Caribbean Basin as its own private domain.

The example of Grenada shows vividly the worth of Washington's verbiage on liberty, democracy and human rights and the moral standards which really rule there.

The words of the Soviet Government statement yesterday sound more topical than ever: it is clear to any person without preconceptions that liberty, democracy and human rights end for the current U.S. Administration where the peoples break off from the fetters of imperialist exploitation and take the path of true independent development.

Multinational 'Coverup'

PY270251 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 26 Oct 83

[From the "Special Program on U.S. Aggression Against Grenada" feature by Valentin Mashkin]

[Excerpt] In an interview granted to Radio Moscow, Victor Volskiy, director of the Latin American Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, among other things, stated as follows: [begin Volskiy recording in Russian, interrupted by Mashkin's translation into Spanish]

Speaking about the reports on this aggression -- Professor Volskiy states -- the main idea is that all Latin American peoples have been put into a dilemma by the United States: whether or not to submit themselves to the United States voluntarily or risk invasion. Not a single Latin American country can rest assured of its sovereignty. Not a single Latin American country can avert the same fate as Grenada if it violates the will of its powerful imperialist neighbor.

Moreover, the United States is making all possible efforts to receive and use any support from vassal states which are submitted to the will of the United States.

The United States is looking for the so-called multinational coverup for its own aggression. It is well known that the aggressors are the U.S. Rangers and Marines, and that the multinational forces are made up only of small contingents of troops from Jamaica, Barbados and other states. These contingents make up the fig leaf for the U.S. landing in Grenada.

WORLD NATIONS ASSAIL U.S. ACTIONS IN GRENADA

Countries in 'Uproar'

LD270122 Moscow TASS in English 2350 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS -- TASS news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

The U.S. armed intervention in Grenada caused an uproar the world over. Governments, statesmen and political figures, the press, the entire international public opinion have denounced the U.S. Administration which openly staged a blatant bandit act for attaining its imperial aims. The international fallout in the wake of Washington's bandit move bears witness to the fact that both the U.S. President and his heavily-operating propaganda machine failed to deceive anyone. Reagan's futile efforts to "explain away" or "justify" his military venture, to give it at least a semblance of some "collective action" have been simply disregarded. This venture is viewed everywhere, including the USA itself, as a totally unprovoked direct aggression of Washington against the independent and sovereign state, a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

U.S. Senator Daniel Moynihan described the U.S. invasion of Grenada as an act of war. In its editorial THE NEW YORK TIMES rejects as unsatisfactory all explanations made by President Reagan and describes U.S. Marines operating in Grenada as occupation troops. A NEW YORK TIMES correspondent reports from Washington that a majority of members of the Congress have been outraged by the U.S.-led invasion of Grenada.

THE TIMES of London writes editorially that the USA has staged an act of aggression against Grenada in contravention of international law and the United Nations Charter. None of the reasons cited by President Reagan by way of an explanation of the invasion of Grenada can serve as a legal justification for an attack on an independent state, THE TIMES writes. The case in point is a direct armed intervention of the USA in Grenada, the French television company Antenne-2 concludes.

So obvious is the criminal and dirty character of the U.S. Administration's move flouting universal norms of international law and the principles of the U.N. Charter that almost all of U.S. allies were quick in dissociating themselves from it, while many others openly condemned Washington. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain was in a hurry to say that British troops were not taking part in the U.S. intervention in Grenada. A statement issued by the Foreign Ministry of France regards Washington's actions as startling from the point of view of international law, and emphasises that no state or group of states have the right to stage a military intervention in another state without an express and specific request of the legitimate authorities of that state and without an official and express permission of the United Nations Security Council.

The wave of wrathful protests has swept Latin American countries. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada has caused a storm of indignation in the Organisation of American States, that is, right there where the USA only recently felt itself very much on top of things. The governments and official spokesmen of Nicaragua, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and other Latin American countries have made statements strongly denouncing the U.S. move.

The countries of the socialist community have branded the U.S. aggression as a crime against peace and humanity. They demand an immediate end to Washington's arbitrary and lawless behavior, the withdrawal of occupation troops from Grenada, and urge all the countries and peoples to stand up for the people of Grenada.

Reagan and his team found themselves in a tight ring of international isolation. Their brutal treatment of the people of Grenada has not won them laurels. It will invariably turn out to be a new major defeat of the interventionist policy of the U.S. Administration, U.S. imperialism in general.

UK 'Sobering Up'

LD262137 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Observer Anatoliy Gan commentary]

[Text] The United States has committed aggression against Grenada. This act of international terrorism, inspired by the U.S. President Reagan, has caused angry protests all over the world. There has been a protest meeting outside the U.S. Embassy in London. Demonstrators, according to the ASSOCIATED PRESS agency, chanted: "Reagan and Thatcher, hands off Grenada."

In the British Parliament the government has responded with silence to a demand from the opposition that U.S. international terrorism should be denounced. The British Government is doing everything to avoid responsibility for the adventurist actions of the U.S. President. In a statement made within hours of the U.S. attack on Grenada the foreign secretary, Geoffrey Howe, assured the House of Commons that the United States had no intention of invading Grenada. What is not clear is who lied to whom: Geoffrey Howe to the MP's or Reagan to the British Government? Whatever the case, the invasion has been carried out. The British Government did nothing to prevent it, although Grenada is a member of the Commonwealth, led by the queen of England. In fact, Reagan has insulted the British Crown and the British Government.

Judging by the position of the prime minister, Thatcher, the British Government has probably decided to follow up Biblical advice and turn the other cheek, or maybe it is just accustomed to its habitual role of a junior partner who wouldn't care to contradict Washington in anything.

It was not by chance that on the eve of the U.S. intervention in Grenada the British press openly admitted that both the White House and Whitehall would be happy to see the last of revolutionary development in Grenada, and it is significant that it is not the British but the Americans that are already making plans to reinstate in Grenada the former British governor general. What is it, a courtesy toward Britain? Or is it the prospect of having a British governor returned to Grenada with the help of U.S. bayonets to serve U.S. interests, a prospect insulting for the British?

The outbreak of anti-American feelings in the British press and even in the British Parliament following the U.S. invasion of Grenada looks quite logical in the light of the above facts. Conservative MP's say that the United States humilates Britain, and that such an insulting attitude to its most loyal ally is inadmissible. Other MP's charge that the government has tied up its policy with U.S. policy too closely. The parliamentary opposition warns that Thatcher's readiness to support Reagan unconditionally fails to lead to support of the most vital interests of Britain by the Americans.

In short, there have been signs in Britain of some sobering up from a pro-American intoxication. The question is: Will this process continue? There is good reason for asking this question since the British Government has more than once swallowed bitter pills prescribed by Washington.

France Issues Condemnation

LD261558 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Paris October 26 TASS -- The U.S. aggression against Grenada has been condemned by French President Francois Mitterrand. In a statement he delivered at a meeting of the Council of Ministers today he stressed that "the international community bases itself on the principles that are valid everywhere, specifically on the principle of the right of every nation to decide its destiny."

Reading out the statement by the president, a spokesman for the French Government pointed out that France thus condemns the U.S. intervention in Grenada, just as any other such actions.

Italy 'Did Not Agree'

LD270642 Moscow TASS in English 0108 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 26 TASS -- Giovanni Spadolini, Italy's defense minister, who is staying in the U.S. for a visit, has criticized the U.S. aggression of Grenada. Speaking at a press conference in the Pentagon, the Italian minister pointed out that Italy did not agree with this step of the United States. Italy is against solving international controversies by means of a military intervention, he also underlined.

CSSR Demands 'Withdrawal'

LD270350 Moscow TASS in English 0103 GMT 27 Oct 83

["Statement of Foreign Ministry of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Prague October 26 TASS -- The Czechoslovak people and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic condemn resolutely the United States' armed aggression against Grenada. They express complete solidarity and support for the struggle of the Grenadian people aimed at protecting the revolutionary gains and the right of the Grenadian people to decide its destiny independently, demand an immediate end to the intervention and the occupiers' withdrawal from the island. This is said in a statement of the Foreign Ministry of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in connection with the armed aggression against Grenada.

The United States Government bears a full responsiblity for this international crime which not only leads to heightening of tension in the area of Central America but is also a serious threat to universal peace, the statement says.

Hungary 'Deeply Shocked'

LD262331 Moscow TASS in English 2313 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Budapest, October 26 TASS -- The Hungarian news agency is authorized to state:

Hungary's public opinion was deeply shocked to hear that the U.S. Armed Forces, replenished by the troops of several Caribbean countries, have committed an aggression against Grenada, which is a full-fledged member of the U.N. and of the Non-Aligned Movement. Reasons advanced in order to justify this aggression are unacceptable, the armed intervention runs counter to the main principles of the U.N. to international norms, it jeoparidzes peace and international security.

The Hungarian People's Republic strongly denounces the aggression against Grenada and demands, together with other peace-loving countries and nations, the immediate termination of the occupation. The Hungarian people voice their solidarity with the people of Grenada, who have been subjected to a heavy trial, and sincerely wish that they again become, as soon as possible, the masters of their own destiny.

GDR 'Solidarity' With Grenada

LD270044 Moscow TASS in English 2358 GMT 26 Oct 83

[Text] Berlin October 26 TASS -- The government and people of the German Democratic Republic condemn resolutely the United States' military invasion of Grenada and assess it as an act of violation of that country's sovereignty. This is said in a statement of a spokesman for the GDR Foreign Ministry circulated here today.

The GDR demands an immediate withdrawal of the aggressors from Grenada, the ensurance for the people of that country of an opportunity to continue to exercise its sovereign rights, the statement says. The GDR expresses solidarity with the Grenadian people and will continue doing everything within its power so that the Grenadian people could continue advancing along the chosen road.

Romanian Condemnation

LD270659 Moscow TASS in English 0130 GMT 27 Oct 83

[Text] Bucharest October 26 TASS -- The Romanian people, Romania's Government condemn the military intervention of the United States and other states in Grenada, demand that it should be immediately ended, that all foreign troops should be withdrawn from Grenada's territory, that its national independence and sovereignty should be ensured. This is said in a statement of the Romanian press agency made on behalf of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

This military interference in Grenada's internal affairs, the statement says, is a gross violation of independence and sovereignty of a young state, of the principles of the United Nations Charter and generally recognized international norms.

PRC on 'Gross Violation'

PM270951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "Hands Off Grenada!": "The U.S. Brazen Aggression Under Fire of Criticism"]

[Text] Beijing October 26 TASS -- A spokesman for the PRC Foreign Ministry condemned resolutely the United States' armed invasion of Grenada and demanded the withdrawal of U.S. forces from that country. He said that the United States' armed invasion of Grenada, no matter under what pretext it had been staged, is a gross violation of the UN Charter and the fundamental norms governing interstate relations.

China is deeply concerned over the situation in Grenada and follows closely the developments in that country, said the spokesman for the PRC Foreign Ministry. The Chinese Government holds that the problems of any state must be decided by its people, without outside interference.

CORRECTION TO ITEM ON U.S. ACTIONS IN NICARAGUA

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Soviet Union Condemns U.S. Invasion of Grenada" published in the 26 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page K 1:

The headline should read: "USSR 'Condemns' U.S. Actions ir Nicaragua"

PRAVDA REPORTS SUPREME SOVIET PLAN, BUDGET DEBATE

PM261225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In Joint Session: At the USSR Supreme Soviet Chamber's Permanent Commissions"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has instructed the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Budget and Planning Commissions and other permanent commissions to make a preliminary examination of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1984, the progress in fulfilling the plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1983, the USSR State Budget for 1984, and the report on the implementation of the USSR State Budget for 1982, and to prepare conclusions on them.

The Presidium recommended that the chambers' permanent commissions, guided by the decision of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee May (1982), November (1982), and June (1983) Plenums, focus their attention on questions of utilizing internal reserves for raising production efficiency, accelerating the introduction of scientific and technical achievements, increasing labor productivity, making rational use of production potential, the economical expenditure of material, manpower, and financial resources, developing the production of consumer goods and the system of services for the population, and improving the balance of the plans.

A joint session of the Budget and Planning Commissions and representatives of other permanent commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers was held in the Kremlin 24 October. The session was led by V.A. Masol, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Budget and Planning Commission.

N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, delivered the report on the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1984 and the progress in fulfilling the plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1983.

A report was heard on the draft USSR State Budget for 1984 and the implementation of the USSR State Budget for 1982; it was delivered by V.F. Garbuzov, USSR minister of finance.

On the basis of a report from N.I. Maslennikov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Budget and Planning Commission, the procedure and schedule were set for examining the 1984 plan and budget, the progress in fulfilling the 1983 plan, and the report on the implementation of the 1982 budget. To this end 17 joint deputies' preparatory commissions were formed.

Taking part in the session were V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; A.S. Barkauskas, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; A.P. Shitikov and V.P. Ruben, chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; chairmen of the chambers' permanent commissions, and ministry and department leaders.

On the same day organizational sessions of the preparatory commissions were held to approve the workplans and discuss other questions.

TRADE UNION HEAD URGES UNITY IN ANTIWAR STRUGGLE

AU251608 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 24 Oct 83 pp 1, 3

[Article by Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the USSR All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions Presidium: "Unity Is an Urgent Necessity of Our Time"]

[Text] The antiwar struggle is one of the most important tasks of the Soviet trade unions. Our basic stand on this question is contained in documents of the 27th congress of Soviet trade unions. This includes the specially adopted resolution of the congress and an appeal to working people and trade unions throughout the world. To stop the arms race, to prevent the danger of nuclear war -- these are the basic tenets of this document.

The USSR trade unions were the initiators of the ILO (International Labor Organization) General Conference held in 1981. The resolution was devoted to the "Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament." The WFTU addressed an appeal to the UN General Assembly in June 1982. In autumn 1982 we submitted a proposal to the trade unions of Western Europe for joint action against the deployment of new missiles on the European Continent so as to bring about a successful conclusion to the Geneva negotiations.

The Soviet trade unions are active participants in the protest meetings organized by our working people against the arms race, against the attempts of the aggressive imperialist circles. Our trade unions are also organizing many other joint peace actions and workers solidarity actions with peoples struggling for independence and freedom. People in the Soviet Union widely celebrated 1 September -- the day of trade union actions for peace. Mass antiwar initiatives, including rallies, as well as working shifts for peace were held throughout the country in 1983. Representatives of trade unions from over 60 countries, including the United States, Great Britain, France, the FRG, Japan, and Australia, came to the USSR in order to participate in these initiatives.

We attach great importance to international trade union cooperation as an important way to rally the efforts of the working people from various countries in the struggle to avert the danger of nuclear disaster and for disarmament. Representatives of the Soviet trade unions actively participated in the preparations and implementation of such great international antiwar meetings and conferences as "Trade Unions of the World Against Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons" (Vietnam, May 1983), "The Role and Place of the Trade Unions in the Contemporary World" (Prague, June 1983), the worldwide trade union conference on the socioeconomic aspects of disarmament in the industrial energy branches (Moscow, August 1983).

We highly appreciate the initiative of the Bulgarian trade unions to organize a meeting-dialogue on "Peace and the Trade Unions" in Sofia, which will undoubtedly represent an important stage in the struggle of the world public against the danger of a nuclear disaster. The Soviet trade unions will most actively participate in this meeting.

The working people and the trade unions in our country responded with great satisfaction to the declaration of Comrade Yuriy Andropov, secretary general of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, made on 29 September 1983, in which a basic evaluation of the contemporary state of international relations and of the militarist policy of the U.S. Administration, representing a considerable threat against peace, was given. The 800,000-strong antiwar demonstration of Moscow citizens held on 1 October 1983 under the slogans "No to Nuclear Arms in Europe!," "Let Us Reduce the Existing Arsenals!," and "Let Us Stop the Nuclear Threat; Together We Can and Must Do It!" was an expression of the nationwide, unanimous support for this declaration.

The considerable aggravation of the international situation provoked by the increasingly aggressive character of the imperialist circles, above all in the United States, circles which are proceeding along the path of obstructing the Geneva negotiations and their policy of further escalating the arms race, is the reason for a particularly broad expansion of antiwar actions adopted by working people and trade unions throughout the world. The "hot autumn" of this year had been marked by numerous protest demonstrations in various countries, particularly in Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, and other NATO member countries that have been declared missile deployment areas.

The growing initiative of the trade unions in the struggle of peace is a process governed by law. The arms race is a heavy burden for the working people and, under these circumstances, it is a principal duty of the trade unions to protect the interests of their members, a duty which is inseparably linked to the struggle for peace and disarmament. This creates a good basis for the intensification of unity of action among trade unions of different orientations in a cause that is of decisive importance for the fate of mankind.

The establishment of trade union cooperation in the antiwar struggle greatly depends upon the stands of the largest trade union organizations -- the WFTU, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and the World Confederation of Labor. As a truly class-minded organization, the WFTU declares its consistent opposition to the militarist policy of the imperialist circles and for unity of action of the trade unions in defending peace. This is in conformity with the basic interests of the working people, who are more and more resolutely protesting against the threat of war and the arms race.

We will also continue in future to seek ways and means for the establishment of cooperation and joint actions with trade unions of different orientations and international affiliations on a bilateral, as well as on a multilateral basis in the struggle for peace and against the forces of war and aggression. Not even one social organization, least of all a trade union organization, can remain a passive observer in discussing contemporary issues of such topical importance as Euromissiles, the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe, the reduction of the level of military confrontation, and others. The effectiveness of seeking mutually-acceptable solutions, of course, directly depends on rallying the efforts of all interested sides. Possibilities exist today for the development of broad trade union cooperation under the socio-economic aspects of disarmament, including the elaboration of trade union conversion models, programs for the creation of working places in civilian branches of industry, and others.

The leaders of the trade union centers of European socialist countries, including the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, have recently adopted an appeal to the trade unions and to all working people in Europe containing a program for trade union actions in the struggle for peace. The cohesion of the efforts of all trade unions and of working people in all European countries is an urgent necessity of our epoch.

The meeting-dialogue scheduled to take place in Sofia will contribute to the expansion of cooperation of various trade unions on questions of the struggle for peace. Permit me to wish the organizers and all participants in this forum successful and fruitful work for the sake of our noble goal -- for ensuring lasting peace, friendship, and cooperation among the peoples.

MARSHAL PETROV OBSERVES FIRING PRACTICE

PM201034 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 83 Second Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Bedzhanyan: "Officers' Combat Aids"]

[Text] Red Banner Carpathian Military District -- The motor riflemen of the company under Captain V. Tsegelnik's command were practicing small arms fire. Marshal of the Soviet Union V. Petrov, commander in chief of Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who was observing them, ordered aiming time to be reduced.

"Now can you get an 'excellent' for this exercise?" he asked Sergeant First Class O. Belous and his men.

"Yes, Sir! Permission to shoot first," the section commander replied.

Sure enough, the sergeant and his men hit the targets first time.

This recent episode is cited in a manual entitled "Officers' Combat Aids" published by the district's political directorate. It describes in detail the experience of Sergeant First Class O. Belous and other junior commanders in training and educating their subordinates and gives officers specific advice on how to improve individual work with sergeants.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON IMPROVING MILITARY TRAINING

Need For Legal Education

PM201052 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 83 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Servicemen's Legal Education"]

[Excerpts] The Communist Party and the Soviet state pay constant attention to strengthening legality and law and order in the country and to educating citizens in the spirit of a conscious attitude to their constitutional obligations and social duty. The CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums advanced new tasks in this sphere. "The normal course of our social development," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed, "is inconceivable without the strictest observance of the laws which protect society's interests and citizens' rights."

The persistent implementation of the party's guidelines is of special significance for further strengthening the Soviet Armed Forces and maintaining their high level of combat readiness. It is extremely important for every serviceman to have a profound understanding of the clauses of the USSR Constitution, the other laws, and military regulations and to be soundly skilled in fulfilling their requirements rigorously. A tested means of achieving these aims is the legal education of servicemen carried out in close conjunction with their political, military, and moral education.

At the same time there are shortcomings in legal education work. Violations of regulations demands are tolerated in some units in the organization of daily life. Instances of distortion of disciplinary practice, incorrect relations between servicemen, and failure to provide personnel with the prescribed allowance have not been eliminated and the explanation of legal documents is not being carried out effectively enough.

As analysis shows, this situation is most often linked with the poor legal training of the actual educators and organizers of this work in units and on ships.

Suffice it to say that until now there have been instances -- especially in Moscow Military District, the Pacific Fleet, and the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany -- of individual leaders issuing orders that contradict the laws and regulations and are subsequently countermanded on the protests of military prosecutors. Senior leaders and political organs must pay more attention to the legal training and education of the officer corps and make more active use of classes in the system of commander training, universities of Marxism-Leninism, and law schools for this purpose. Practical scientific conferences and seminars must be held more frequently. Correct action is being taken in those places where special classes and discussions with military lawyers are organized for officers appointed commanders of units and individual subunits for the first time.

Commanders, staffs, political organs, and military prosecutors must be more demanding in their approach to the assessment of the state of discipline and law and order in subunits and units. This task is particularly topical in the current period of final checks. Party and Komsomol organizations must display more concern for the exemplary behavior of servicemen who are communists or Komsomol members both in service and in everyday life. The party report and election meetings, which are currently being held, provide a good opportunity for principled and exacting discussion of the state of discipline, organization, and legality in military collectives.

Technical Training

PM201102 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 83 Second Edition p 1

[Article by Major M. Balabov: "Time To Compare Grades"]

[Text] Air Defense Troops -- The fall has somehow imperceptibly and swiftly gilded the leaves on the trees, but we sensed its arrival from other signs. The campaign to fulfill our pledges has acquired particular intensity in our radio engineering battalion, now that the training year is almost over. There is an increased sense of responsibility for the end result of every class and training session.

At an official officers' conference and party bureau session we duly analyzed areas in which we are lagging behind, what assistance is needed, and by whom. Many different suggestions were made concerning ways of intensifying the training process. The officers were unanimous about one thing, however: More attention must be focused on working with people on an individual basis, since overall success is ultimately the sum of individual successes.

The weak links in servicemen's training are more clearly apparent on the eve of the summing up for the year. Some of them need to increase their theoretical knowledge in order to tackle with confidence the forthcoming class tests, while others are insufficiently skilled at combat work in particularly complex tactical situations. A subunit's officers and ensigns cannot succeed in everything, you might think. We have, however, found an effective way of improving the ranks' specialist training and have succeeded in ensuring that no individual's successes go unnoticed. This has been made possible by holding daily 90-minute training sessions for full- and reduced-strength combat details. In the process not one session has been conducted without using simulated targets and interference.

Chief of Staff Major Ye. Shchenkhor has taken on the task of drilling the weaker details. The officer places his charges in conditions typical of intense modern combat. Every training session ends with a thorough analysis of every specialist's successes and shortcomings. As a result, within a month the laggard details have noticeably made up ground on the leaders.

For example, some of Senior Lieutenant G. Korenkov's men were rather lacking in proficiency and were sometimes late in issuing information, but now they can compete on equal terms with the top specialists.

The detail headed by Captain Ye. Prostak was also giving cause for misgivings. The battalion commander and his deputies knew, of course, about the problems in the technical training of the detail's specialists. It had, however, been hoped that Officer Prostak would be able to remedy the situation. Time passed, however, and there was no change for the better. It did not take long to establish why: The methodological and organizational standard of the instruction given to the detail was not always up to scratch. The situation had to be remedied.

On a couple of occasions Company Commander Major V. Lesun attended the exercises conducted by Captain Prostak, chatted with his subordinates, and observed how they felt about self-teaching. He shared his observations with the battalion commander. The conclusion was drawn that drill in the detail was not always up to scratch methodologically and organizationally. This was particularly true of technical training. The matter was discussed at the next party bureau session. It transpired that the battalion's engineering and technical personnel are still not being fully involved in technical training classes. Communist officers with an engineering background can, of course, do a lot to keep equipment in a state of high combat readiness. We have not, however, seen them as drill instructors as often as we would have liked. But new experienced and able officers like Engineers Captain A. Smolyanets, Engineers Senior Lieutenant A. Kirillov, and others have, as they say, "descended" on details. They not only skillfully conduct drills but also comprehensively test the men's knowledge of equipment and arrange additional classes on particularly complex topics.

The provisional data we have on entering the training year's final phase are as follows: The average grade for the performance of combat duty by radio engineering companies is 4.6. In absolute terms it has remained at last year's level. But if you take into account the considerably greater demands on subunits' combat readiness, this stable grade conceals an undoubted increase in the personnel's skill. The company commanded by Captain V. Ilushko, which has its sights set on achieving an "excellent" rating, has made conspicuous progress. About 40 percent of the men there have achieved "excellent" ratings. All the ranks, without exception, have been trained to successfully come through the grade tests -- to either achieve or exceed the standard.

These are, of course, only provisional figures. The time for taking stock of the year is almost at hand. We will do whatever is needed to fulfill in their entirety the pledges we have adopted.